

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

21 August 1985

USSR REPORT INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL

CDE, Geneva Talks in Context of East-West Relations (Teygiz Gamkrelidze; ZARYA VOSTOKA, 29 May 85).....	1
USSR: Dangers of U.S. Military Space Programs Stressed (V. Israelyan; KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 6, Jun 85).....	7
Speeches Assailing SDI at WPC March Meeting Reported (XX CENTURY AND PEACE, No 5, May 85).....	19
Editorial Introduction	19
Zhukov, Velikhov, Molina Speeches	20

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

1945 Debates Over UN Security Council Veto Rights Recalled (NEW TIMES, No 26, Jun 85).....	23
International Cooperation in Use of Antarctica Lauded (Vyacheslav Markin; NEW TIMES, No 26, Jun 85).....	27

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

Vneshtorgbank Chairman on Credit Aspects of East-West Trade (Yuri Ivanov Interview; NEW TIMES, No 27, Jul 85).....	31
Christian Theologians, Marxists Confer on Peace Movement (V. Matveyev; NAUKA I RELIGIYA, No 5, May 85).....	35

Press Conference on CSCE Anniversary Pamphlet Publication (B. Ivanov; IZVESTIYA, 20 Jul 85).....	40
SOCIALIST COMMUNITY AND CEMA AFFAIRS	
Importance of Warsaw Pact for Non-European Socialist States (O. Stroganov; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 14 May 85).....	43
THIRD WORLD ISSUES	
West's Attempt To Use Islam for Anti-Soviet Purposes Scored (Sh. Hikmatov; OQITUVCHILAR GAZETASI, 1 May 85).....	47
Briefs	
Foreign Students at Tashkent Institute	51
UNITED STATES AND CANADA	
PRAVDA Stresses Military Aspects of U.S. Space Programs (V. Sukhoy; PRAVDA, 27 May 85).....	52
Political Scientist Hits U.S. Interest in Islamic Problems (S. Radzhabov; KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 4 Jun 85).....	56
WESTERN EUROPE	
U.S. Said To Impose Arms Burden on West Europe (A. Drozhzhin; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 19 Jul 85).....	61
Norwegian Minister Sees Possibility for More Trade With USSR (A. Haugstvedt Interview; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 24 Jul 85).....	64
PRAVDA Views Implications of Spanish Government Reshuffle (Vladimir Chernyshev; APN DAILY REVIEW, 10 Jul 85).....	66
IZVESTIYA Notes Icelandic Vote for Nuclear-Free Status (N. Ivanov; IZVESTIYA, 29 May 85).....	67
LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN	
TASS Official Assails U.S. Policies in Region (Yu. Romantsov; MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 7, Jul 85).....	69
Ulterior Motives Alleged in U.S. Stance on Mexican Drug Trade (S. Zavorotnyy; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 19 May 85).....	82
CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC	
Soviet Weekly Assails Japanese Interest in SDI (Y. Tavrovsky; NEW TIMES, No 26, Jun 85).....	84

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

Israel CP Leader Calls for End to Israeli Aggression (Meir Vil'ner; PRAVDA, 18 May 85).....	87
Roots of Lebanon Conflict Examined, Future Seen Unclear (Pavel Demchenko; ZA RUBEZHOM, No 15, 5-11 Apr 85).....	91
The 'Islamic Factor' and Current Anticommunism (M. Usmanov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 13 Jun 85).....	100
PRAVDA Cites PDRY Leader on Soviet Aid (V. Peresada; PRAVDA, 13 Jun 85).....	104
Briefs Tunisian Delegation Visits Tashkent	105

ARMS CONTROL

CDE, GENEVA TALKS IN CONTEXT OF EAST-WEST RELATIONS

Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 29 May 85 p 3

[Article by ZARYA VOSTOKA political reviewer Teygiz Gamkrelidze under the rubric "Following the Event: Facts and Commentary": "Parade of Hypocrisy"]

[Text] [Box insert] Stockholm: Search for ways of European settlement/Geneva: New round of talks/Good will is necessary/Dangerous plans and hypocritical rhetoric of the overseas "peacemakers"/They wish to bury the truth.

Discussions have resumed in Stockholm concerning real steps which would promote normalization of the political climate on the European continent. The next round of the Soviet-American talks on space and nuclear arms begins tomorrow in Geneva.

Participants of the Stockholm Conference on measures for strengthening trust and security and on disarmament in Europe assembled in the Swedish capital for a new session of this forum, at which the delegations of 33 European countries as well as the United States and Canada are represented. The importance of the Geneva talks is common knowledge: the attention of the world public is riveted on them.

Representatives of the socialist countries emphasized in the very first statements in Stockholm that they will continue to bend every effort to come up with those solutions which would help divert the threat of nuclear war from the world, stop the arms race on Earth and prevent it in space. That is the permanent foreign policy line of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

The Soviet Union again demonstrated its will for peace in the Address "To Peoples, Parliaments and Governments of All Countries." This contains a proposal to subordinate the relations of powers possessing nuclear weapons to specific rules, including the obligation of not being the first to employ them. It includes the call to support the draft treaty on mutual non-use of military force, which would preclude the employment both of nuclear and conventional arms. It also includes an appeal to the states of Europe as well as to the United States and Canada to undertake effective steps to clear this continent both of medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons as well as chemical arms, to

promote the establishment of non-nuclear weapon zones, to reduce military expenditures, to take steps without delay to reach mutually acceptable understandings at the Stockholm Conference and the Vienna talks, and to settle the conflicts in Central America, the Near East and Southeast Asia by peaceful means and without intervention in the internal affairs of the countries located there...

We are awaiting a positive response to these proposals from western countries.

The Soviet Union recently made one other good-will gesture on its part by making the decision on a unilateral moratorium on further deployment of medium-range missiles and on suspending the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe.

The Soviet Union supported the proposal to stop all nuclear tests by 6 August of this year--the 40th anniversary of the explosion of an atomic bomb over Hiroshima. This is just one of a number of steps undertaken by our country to achieve disarmament.

It could be expected that the U.S. government would welcome this proposal, but it hastened to reject it.

U.S. President Reagan made an address in which he admitted that the Stockholm Conference had a "unique opportunity to play an important role in improving relations between East and West." And what happened?

Matters did not go beyond these declarations--the American president repeated the West's previous position, characterized by an absence of a constructive and positive approach to the issues under discussion and by a policy, the postulates of which are based on hypocrisy and lies.

In this as well as other speeches by the president there was not even a hint of readiness to take a businesslike attitude toward the new Soviet proposals, which open the way out of the dead end into which Washington would like to take Soviet-American relations. For example, the actual response to the unilateral moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union was a continuation of deployment of Pershing II missiles on FRG territory and, as it turns out (in clear violation of pledges made by the United States to the allies themselves), it plans to deploy not 108, but 258 Pershing II's on FRG territory.

The Reagan administration played the hypocritical game with words about "freedom," "peace" and "partnership" earlier as well, but this time especially refined flows of lies and slander fell from the White House against the Soviet Union, Cuba and other countries of the socialist community.

What hypocrisy must one have to speak, in a message of greeting sent to Moscow, about the desire to go together "along the path of new progress toward goals of attaining a more stable peace and eliminating nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth," and at the European Parliament in Strasbourg to impudently slander the USSR, falsely accusing it of "aggressiveness" and ascribing to us the intent of "delivering a first strike" with nuclear forces, although the

entire world knows of the Soviet Union's pledge not to be first to use nuclear weapons, made unilaterally in 1982 and solemnly confirmed on the 40th anniversary of the Victory.

Washington lies when it asserts that the USSR began the arms race in space, and it leads people astray by saying that the United States is concerned only with defense, and our country is concerned only with offensive arms. Washington allows irresponsible statements to the effect that the USSR is not observing its recently announced moratorium. Washington resorts to deception in asserting that the Soviet Union has "nuclear superiority." And Washington casts prudence to the wind to prove that U.S. space plans are exceptionally "humane" and that this is only scientific research, at the end of which the United States can reject deployment of a widescale system of space-based ballistic missile defense...

It is a lie deeply entangled in hypocrisy and pharisaism.

And who does not see clearly that U.S. readiness "to promote the elimination of the artificial division of Europe" conceals plans for a revision of postwar frontiers, the "absorption" of the GDR by West Germany, and a change of the social systems in other socialist states?

The "peace proposals" of the head of the U.S. administration which were advertised in advance include not only such secondary measures as the establishment of a permanent military communications line or the meeting of military representatives, but they also reanimate the proposal on legalizing espionage under the guise of strengthening trust, which was advanced by NATO countries at the Stockholm Conference. These pseudopeaceloving proposals are nothing more than mimicry and a diversionary maneuver undertaken in the face of the specific and important USSR initiatives.

V. I. Lenin warned back at the beginning of the present century that the rapid growth of science and technology was opening up not only the greatest opportunities, but also the greatest dangers. Lenin foresaw that in the hands of imperialist reactionaries the fruits of scientific-technical progress can lead to an undermining of the very conditions for existence of a human society. Socialism specifically sees one of its historic tasks to be to make it impossible to use the knowledge achieved by science against man.

By developing systems of space arms, the Reagan administration hopes to establish nuclear domination over the entire world, writes Howard Parsons, a well-known American scientist and a professor of philosophy at Bridgeport University.

The contradictory and hypocritical position taken by the United States at the Geneva talks is disrupting all efforts aimed at achieving reasonable agreements. Washington does not wish disarmament. The Pentagon asserts that the tests it is conducting under the "star wars" program allegedly are not in violation of provisions of the ABM Treaty. At the same time, the American Defense Department is retaining the "right" to ignore this treaty, referring here to mythical "violations" of the treaty on the part of the Soviet Union.

It is difficult to say what is greater here: the lies or the hypocrisy.

The fact is that the Reagan administration already is moving on to practical tests of components of a widescale ballistic missile defense system with their placement in outer space.

According to a Pentagon announcement, there will be tests of one of the important components of the "star wars" system during the flight of the Discovery spacecraft planned for mid-June: equipment for precise guidance of a laser beam from Earth to objects flying in near-Earth space.

The purpose of this program also is well known. A system stationed in space and capable of detecting and destroying an ascending missile in a matter of minutes also can destroy means of national verification and warning intended for notification of nuclear attack. Thus their destruction (as admitted by American military personnel as well) serves as preparation of a first strike and actually is tantamount to nuclear attack.

Washington can deliver a first strike only after being certain that a retaliatory strike will not be disastrous for the United States itself. They are specifically trying to develop the ABM system to guarantee the impunity of the aggressor.

And finally, there are no guarantees that under the pretext of deploying ABM space stations, an offensive attack system intended for destroying strategic targets on Earth will not be secretly deployed. The United States always has tried to encircle the USSR with nuclear bases, and space will become a sphere for deployment of new strategic weapons.

The U.S. imperialist circles are looking at relations with other states through the notch of a gunsight. "Peace always will have to be built only on strength" is the principal postulate of White House politicians. And so they intimidate taxpayers in the United States and other NATO countries by the fact that allegedly "the shadow of Soviet power hovers" over Western Europe, Africa and Central America. Meanwhile, they themselves are developing more and more new military facilities in an attempt to enmesh Europe and other continents in a network of aggressive bases.

A new tracking station now is being established in Portugal, in the small town of (Talef dush Causadush).

In the opinion of the newspaper DIARIO DE NOTICIAS, this station, which is part of the Space Track space system, will close a ring with which the Pentagon has girdled the globe. Construction of this station is directly related to the notorious "strategic defense initiative" of the U.S. president or, in other words, to the "star wars" program. Three such facilities having the primary purpose of maintaining communications with U.S. military spy satellites already have become operational: in the American state of New Mexico, in the Hawaiian Islands and in South Korea. Construction of a fourth station is under way on the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. The station in the south of Portugal will be the final link. It will be directly subordinate to the North American Joint Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD).

A large radar has been set up on the island of Shemya in the Aleutian Islands. Components tested for the purpose of ballistic missile defense were used in its construction in violation of agreed understandings. This station can be used to establish a radar field for ballistic missile defense of U.S. territory, which contradicts the obligation of Article I of the ABM Treaty.

Construction of large radars such as the Pave Paws, the specifications of which have been taken to the level of requirements for ABM radars, also represents a similar violation of the treaty: establishment of a radar field covering a large portion of U.S. territory. Two of those radars already have been built on the U.S. west and east coasts, and construction of another two is under way in the south.

The United States is building a large Pave Paws radar far beyond the limits of its territory, in Greenland, in violation of the obligation "not to deploy in the future radars for early warning of strategic ballistic missile attack except at locations along the periphery of its national territory and oriented outward."

Millions of people throughout the world are asking the question: Why is there no progress at Geneva? The United States is employing the tactics of an open prolongation of the dialogue here. This is being done to build up arsenals of strategic offensive arms, and particularly the MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, behind the screen of talks. The stationing of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe is continuing. At the same time it is common knowledge that the United States is making new efforts to accelerate the "star wars" program.

All this is being done under the hypocritical and false pretense of intimidating the Americans with the old myth of the "Soviet threat." Devout professional liars from the Reagan administration boast of their peaceful intentions at Geneva and even propagandize the "star wars" program as a "step toward peace." This lie is being created to justify the mad dream of a victory in the "star wars."

Washington views the future of mankind and particularly the future of American-Soviet relations exclusively in military terms, as a clash under the slogan "Better dead than Red" with the use of the entire arsenal of the most destructive means of warfare. It is assumed here that the possession of space arms should predetermine the outcome of this clash in favor of the United States.

An authoritative American journal such as the BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS writes that, as shown by an analysis of recent administration statements, the president's policy is aimed at persuading the public and Congress that modernization of nuclear arsenals and arms control are one and the same. "I am convinced more and more that the White House doesn't want arms limitation agreements unless they provide the United States with strategic superiority," emphasizes H. Brown, chief editor of the journal.

In violation of the understandings reached, Washington is altogether refusing to discuss the question of nonproliferation of the arms race to outer space simultaneously with a discussion of the question of nuclear arms limitation and reduction.

Regarding the myth of the "Soviet military threat," wasn't it really from the USSR and other socialist countries that there came practical, realistically feasible proposals to clear all kinds of nuclear weapons from Europe and destroy chemical weapons and other kinds of deadly arms? Wasn't it really the countries of the socialist community which repeatedly proposed to exclude the use of military force in deciding thorny issues among states?

The recent meeting in Warsaw again refuted the false thesis of imperialist propaganda, which attempts to place responsibility on the Soviet Union and fraternal socialist countries for the split of Europe and the postwar world. History bears witness that this was done by the creators of NATO. Moreover, as participants of the Warsaw meeting again reminded us, the socialist states have repeatedly expressed a readiness to dissolve the Warsaw Treaty if NATO agrees to do the same. Many major initiatives aimed at strengthening peace in Europe and at detente are specifically connected with the Warsaw Treaty. The Warsaw meeting confirmed the general readiness of socialist countries to continue to collectively seek ways to eliminate the threat of war and expand international cooperation.

At the same time, the unanimous decision to extend the effective period of the Warsaw Treaty was dictated by a need to ensure the security of fraternal allied states and to keep their defensive capability at the proper level. The Czechoslovak RUDE PRAVO recalls in this connection the words of Lenin that a revolution must be able to defend itself.

The Soviet land is entering a period of preparation for the upcoming 27th CPSU Congress. Our party's recent April Central Committee Plenum defined the basic lines of preparation for the congress, which should be a milestone in the country's history. Profound comprehension of the existing situation, bold decisions and vigorous action are what the party Central Committee is calling for from the entire people. The fact is that further changes and transformations and the attainment of a new qualitative status of socialist society lie ahead.

Peace is necessary for this.

The Land of Soviets and other socialist states are demonstrating their constant adherence to the cause of peace. We spared no cost for victory in the war and we will spare no cost for the victory of peace on Earth.

6904

CSO: 5200/1306

ARMS CONTROL

USSR: DANGERS OF U.S. MILITARY SPACE PROGRAMS STRESSED

Riga KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII in Russian No 6, Jun 85 pp 46-56

[Article by V. Israelyan, doctor of historical sciences, and N. Neyland:
"Space Should Serve the Peace"]

[Text] The Washington administration's plans to extend the arms race to space generate alarm in all the peaceloving public. The fact is that militarization of outer space will sharply increase the danger of nuclear war if a reliable barrier is not erected in its path. It is a question not only of the fate of modern civilization, but also of the preservation of man as a biological species.

The Soviet Union is a resolute enemy of competition in any arms race, including space arms. Having opened the space era in 1957 by launching the world's first artificial satellite, the USSR introduced a proposal to the United Nations as early as 1958 which provided for prohibiting the use of outer space for military purposes.

It is noteworthy that one of the first clashes of opposing trends, militaristic and peaceful, in the study of space occurred at the very beginning of our century. A message from America about tests of a combat rocket allegedly conducted there appeared 80 years ago in the Russian newspaper ILLYUSTRIROVANNYYE BIRZHEVYYE VEDOMOSTI. On hearing that Tsiolkovskiy in Russia had developed the theory of a gigantic rocket which would take people up and deliver them to celestial bodies, a journalist wrote figuratively that it already had been tested in America and had thrown "projectiles filled with bullets to great distances." This was a typical canard, but it led the father of future cosmonautics to sad reflection. "I never worked to perfect methods of warfare," he wrote angrily to the newspaper. "I had peaceful, lofty goals: to conquer the universe for the good of mankind." Tsiolkovskiy called adherents of the opposite trend universal sharks, borrowing this scathing expression from the American inventor Edison.

What would Tsiolkovskiy and Edison say had they lived to see the very dangerous space missile exercises of the present U.S. administration, whose advisers demand "driving the enemy into a technological dead-end"?

Over a quarter-century has passed since the day the era of peaceful development of space began. In these years man's creative genius and labor have placed thousands of satellites into near-Earth orbits, they have reached the Moon, and have sent automatic laboratories to far-off planets. More than 140 Earth emissaries have been in space. Our countryman Yuriy Gagarin was the first among them. His flight on 12 April 1961 marked mankind's greatest victory over the forces of nature. Entire crews began to set off on space trips over Gagarin's road and man dared to emerge from the flying craft into open space.

Spacecraft initially were launched for experimental purposes, and then there was a turn to their broader use for practical earthly needs. Automatic satellites, sounding rockets, interplanetary laboratories, manned craft and orbital stations revealed to mankind much that was new about the Earth and the space around it.

With the help of space technology people learned a new way of solving problems of communications, navigation, geodesy and cartography, compiling long-range weather forecasts, monitoring the environment, studying natural resources and determining the coordinates of the crews of ships and aircraft in distress. The KOSPAS-SARSAT system for searching for vessels and aircraft in distress can serve as an example of successful international collaboration in the development of space for the welfare of mankind. Developed through the joint efforts of the USSR, United States, Canada and France, it already has helped save over 250 citizens of different countries.

Space technology helped astronomers "see" the reverse side of the Moon and obtain portraits of Venus and Mars, collect very interesting data on the Sun, and make a journey to Jupiter and Saturn.

Another example of the productive cooperation of various states in the peaceful development of space was the December 1984 launch of a space station from the Soviet Union in the direction of Venus and Halley's Comet. Austria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the FRG and Czechoslovakia are participating with France and the Soviet Union in this bold project, known by the name "Vega." The joint Soviet-American flight of the Soyuz and Apollo craft also should be viewed in terms of such cooperation.

The prophetic words of our great countryman K. E. Tsiolkovskiy, who predicted that space would present mankind with "mountains of bread and a huge amount of power," are beginning to come true. This wise and perspicacious person expressed one other valuable thought: "Mankind is acquiring a universal ocean, seemingly given it intentionally in order to join people in a single whole, in a single family..."

Like the development of space technology itself, the development of space, penetration into its depths and use of its unique features represent a completely new and very specific sphere of human endeavor. On the one hand, colossal opportunities for progress open up for mankind and, on the other hand, such activity may lead the world to incalculable misfortunes. It is all a matter of how these achievements will be used, since there is no fundamental

difference between rockets carrying equipment into space for peaceful scientific research and rockets used for military purposes.

A number of treaties and agreements was concluded at the initiative of the Soviet Union and other socialist states which on the whole established a rather good basis for assuring the peaceful development of outer space. The international Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water was concluded in 1963. This was a first but very important step in the campaign of mankind's peaceloving forces for a clean space.

The Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies was signed in 1967. It provides for the obligation not to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, not to install such weapons on celestial bodies and not to station such weapons in outer space in any other manner.

In 1972 the USSR and United States concluded the very important Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Systems. The parties pledged "not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

The Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques was concluded in 1977. This international agreement also encompasses methods of modifying near-Earth space for military purposes and the use of space for modifying the Earth's environment.

The pledges of states to assure the peaceful use of the Moon and other celestial bodies of the solar system are specified in an agreement signed in 1979.

But now the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes does not suit everyone. People abroad deemed it necessary to take the path of developing space arms to achieve their hegemonic goals. The American side, for example, broke off talks on antisatellite systems which were held during 1977-1979. Plans for the militarization of space have assumed an especially ominous scope with the arrival of the present U.S. administration to power.

Considering the danger of the existing situation, which may turn into a disaster for all mankind, the United Nations Organization adopted a resolution in its General Assembly in 1984 calling on the Geneva Disarmament Conference to accelerate consideration of the question of preventing an arms race in space. A discussion of this point at this Conference's winter-spring session of 1985 showed that the overwhelming majority of the 40 countries party to this international forum expressed interest in preserving space as a sphere of mankind's peaceful endeavors. There was a widely recognized need for additional international legal measures in order to guard space against the spread of the arms race to it.

Washington's plans and programs aimed at using space for military strategic purposes and for disturbing the existing parity in the correlation of world forces caused serious concern for the overwhelming majority of conferees. The

Indian delegation, for example, criticized American arguments that space weapons allegedly will make nuclear offensive arms "ineffective" and "obsolete," stressing that in the best instance this was an attempt to pass off something desirable as reality, and in the worst instance, to strengthen a nuclear first strike potential.

Swedish representative M. B. (Teorin) gave the reminder from the Conference rostrum that the ABM Treaty of 1972 prohibits space-based ABM systems, but doesn't limit development of antisatellite kinds of arms. Calling for a ban on the development, testing and deployment of all space arms, she proposed that all states refrain from this until such an agreement was signed. In her opinion it was necessary to prohibit the use of antisatellites against the spacecraft of other states.

Sri Lanka representative Ambassador (Janapala) stressed that "the development of antisatellite weapons will not lead to a strengthening of stability, but more likely will be a source of mistrust." He cautioned that "this will dangerously increase the risk of war because of technical error or even because of a chance collision of satellites."

The People's Republic of China delegation called for concentrating efforts above all on prohibiting the research, testing, development, production, deployment and use of any kinds of space weapons including antisatellites and space-based ballistic missile defense, and eliminating the existing systems of such weapons.

Various public and scientific organizations also point out the mortal danger of an arms race in space. Suffice it to refer in this regard to the international congress held in July of last year in Göttingen (FRG) under the slogan "Realizing responsibility for the cause of peace, scientists and naturalists caution against the danger of a militarization of space." There were 2,500 scientists from various countries who took part in this representative forum. An international meeting held in the Papal Academy of Sciences in the Vatican in which prominent scientists participated from ten countries including the USSR and United States sounded the call in January 1985 "to prohibit the deployment and testing of all arms in outer space."

But Washington is still deaf to the voice of reason. Its present approach to a resolution of problems involving the use of outer space cannot be viewed in isolation from the general line of U.S. policy for breaking the existing balance between East and West in the strategic military area and achieving superiority. A direct gamble essentially is being made on breaking forward in the military sense through space, relying on the U.S. industrial-technological potential, in order then to dictate its will. "It is possible to keep the whole world in fear from space" was how Col J. Lousma, commander of the American Shuttle spacecraft, frankly summed up the purpose of Washington's plans.

A graphic illustration of this sort of calculation is the presidential directive of 4 July 1982, which determines the basic directions of U.S. activity in space. According to the directive, American space programs propose the

development of a "space defense" as one of their principal objectives. Further, "the United States will continue to develop the potential of antisatellite systems for the purpose of their operational deployment." And so the gamble is being made on a widescale ABM system (also including a space element) on the one hand, and on antisatellites on the other hand. In addition to plans for military use of the Shuttle spacecraft, these two programs concentrate within themselves the efforts of the U.S. military-industrial complex to extend the arms race to space.

Let's take the plan for developing a widescale ABM system, which the American president announced in his sadly familiar television speech of 23 March 1983 and which was confirmed by Presidential Directive No 119 signed on 6 January 1984. This project was called a "strategic defense initiative." It is a question of a program providing for the deployment of a multilayered ABM system in several tiers intended for "screening" U.S. territory. It is proposed to develop a system which would be capable of engaging the other side's ballistic missiles on the final leg of the trajectory during their entry into the atmosphere, during the flight through space, and during the missile's boost when it has just begun movement toward the target.

In the opinion of American specialists, one of the most promising directions is the use of lasers as well as of beam weapons, i.e., beams consisting of charged elementary particles. American designers also are thinking about deploying a system of very precise mirrors in space which could be used to transmit destructive beam energy from ground-based sources "to all corners of the world." The very work of implementing such a program has a provocative, destabilizing character regardless of its end results.

The U.S. course toward producing an antisatellite weapon also is just as dangerous for international peace. The deployment of such a weapon would lead to an abrupt destabilization of the situation and an increase in the threat of surprise attack, and it would undermine efforts to assure trust among nuclear-weapon states.

The destruction of satellites performing important functions of observation and communications would permit an attacking side to count on "blinding the enemy," catching him unawares, and weakening his capability of retaliation in case of nuclear aggression. An attack on a satellite thus would be an aggressive act, and an act which could be fully considered as preparation for a nuclear first strike.

Special antisatellite missiles launched from aboard high-altitude F-15 fighters presently are being developed within the framework of the ASAT program (the production of antisatellite weapons). The first tests of such a system were held in January 1984 and new tests are to be conducted in June of this year. A special danger of the U.S. antisatellite weapon is that it is conceived as a dual-purpose system, i.e., not only for the destruction of satellites, but also for tests of beam weapons intended for intercepting and destroying nuclear warheads. If one considers the U.S. capabilities for deploying air forces, it follows that the United States could deploy its antisatellite system in any part of the globe in the shortest possible time period

and it would be capable of organizing a coordinated attack at its discretion at any time.

The U.S. course toward militarization of space is reinforced by a number of organizational measures and by establishment of a special command and control structure.

A decision was made in November 1984 to establish the U.S. Armed Forces Joint Space Command. A space center is being built for controlling military actions in space and a military space port is being constructed for the reusable Shuttle craft, the operational program of which is in fact under Pentagon direction.

In the minds of those who have not given up plans for attaining military superiority, space weapons are to play the role of a key element of the potential for a first strike employing nuclear weapons.

The "star wars" program, intended for achieving military superiority through space, is a deadly scheme for mankind inasmuch as it concerns the practical development and deployment of a largescale ABM system over U.S. territory. Such a system clearly is intended for delivering a first strike while avoiding or substantially neutralizing retaliation.

That conclusion also is confirmed by the fact that the United States has rejected a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and its plans for deploying antimissile systems are accompanied by a build-up in strategic offensive arms.

The legitimate question arises: If this program really is aimed at making offensive nuclear weapons unnecessary, why is there an unprecedented build-up in the American strategic nuclear arsenal in parallel with this? This includes the production of the MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, deployment of the Pershing II missiles in Europe, and construction of new Stealth bombers, Tomahawk cruise missiles and Trident II missiles for nuclear-powered submarines. U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger doesn't even deem it necessary to conceal that implementation of all these programs in the strategic arms area is aimed at a sharp increase in U.S. capabilities to deliver a nuclear first strike.

The following reasonable question also suggests itself: If Washington is placing emphasis on "defense," then why deploy nuclear first strike weapons near the borders of the USSR and its allies?

The dangerous nature of plans for militarization of space also is recognized in the United States itself, in Congress. For example, Congressman G. Brown warns that implementation of such plans will intensify the arms race since the Soviet Union will regard them as a program for developing a first strike weapon. The congressman called upon the administration to place a moratorium on tests of antisatellite weapons and do everything to prevent the militarization of space. D. Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, condemned plans for deploying an ABM system with space-based elements.

Congressman R. Castenmeier called for rejecting the "star wars" program and reaching an agreement on preventing an arms race in space.

This is understandable, for historical experience indicates that every time the United States has tried to assure itself of military superiority by development of the latest arms this generated retaliatory actions on the part of the USSR for the purpose of preserving the existing parity, and a new spiral of the arms race would begin.

If the militarization of space fails to be halted promptly, it will absorb enormous material and nonmaterial resources and will entail an unprecedented growth in military expenditures. According to American data, the "star wars" research program alone will swallow up \$26 billion during 1986-1989.

It is planned to spend \$1.4 billion in Fiscal Year 1985 for these purposes. Judging from specialists' estimates, the development of a multilayered ABM system with space-based components will cost \$1.5-2 trillion.

It is also impossible not to dwell on the international legal consequences of the U.S. course toward militarization of space. This is also especially necessary because a campaign has intensified in Washington of late for spreading concocted accusations of other states, including the USSR, for violating international obligations.

Washington would like to use talk about Soviet "violations" to hide the fact that the United States itself long ago set a course toward destabilizing the system of international agreements and undermining the 1972 permanent ABM Treaty. This concerns a very important document, which made it possible to conclude the 1972 Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, as well as the SALT II Treaty.

The introduction of an all-encompassing ABM system with space-based elements is possible only at the cost of eliminating the ABM Treaty. The unfolding of extensive scientific research and development [R&D] and the conduct of practical tests of individual system components are objectively leading to the undermining of this very important Soviet-American treaty. Pentagon representatives themselves are forced to admit this. U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger stated plainly on 12 September 1984: "At this stage . . . we are conducting research to determine whether or not a completely reliable system can be developed. If it can, we will have to go beyond the scope of the ABM Treaty." Or take Weinberger's television interview in which he admitted that he "never was an adherent of the ABM Treaty." General Abrahamson, director of the ABM program, also makes no attempt to conceal the Pentagon's true intentions. He stated on 17 December 1984: "When only part of the all-encompassing ABM system has been developed and is ready for use, the United States will have to agree with the USSR on a modification of the ABM Treaty since some of its provisions will diverge from the system's missions."

And the matter is not limited to statements alone. In direct contradiction with precise provisions of the 1972 Treaty, work is in full swing in the United States to develop mobile ABM radars and to use Minuteman missiles as

ABM missiles; multiple-warhead re-entry vehicles are being developed for the ABM missiles; and radars (Pave Paws) are being deployed for radar support to the ballistic missile defense of the greater part of U.S. territory.

The implementation of a program of a largescale ABM system with space-based elements inevitably will give rise to an uncontrolled arms race in all directions, especially since Washington entirely refuses to ratify another important document, the SALT II Treaty. It actually has been derailed. The fact is that peoples of the world hoped that its entry into force would open the way to achieve new effective agreements aimed at stopping the arms race and reducing the threat of war.

Washington has had no desire to reckon with the peoples' interests. Moreover, as it now has been learned, Washington only declared the intent "to refrain from actions" which would undermine the SALT II Treaty as a matter of form. In reality there was a different plan: to bypass the restrictions established under the treaty, to try to break the parity fixed in the treaty, and to secure military superiority.

Washington's genuine attitude toward the obligations stemming from the SALT II Treaty is indicated by the fact that the draft military budget for FY 1986, which the administration just submitted to Congress, contains plans for deploying strategic offensive arms which, if implemented, would signify U.S. departure far beyond the limits of restrictions on ballistic missiles established by the treaty.

Meanwhile, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the aforementioned international legal documents for strengthening peace and security, considering in particular that the 1972 ABM Treaty as well as the SALT I and SALT II treaties contain obligations not to impede "national technical means of verification." This means that in reality the satellites for photography, electronic satellites, early warning satellites as well as certain satellites for observing ocean areas are protected by those agreements against destruction and interference.

In order to develop an all-encompassing ABM system the United States is ready to derail other international agreements as well, among them the 1963 treaty prohibiting nuclear tests in three media, the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, and the 1977 Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques.

The true nature of plans for the militarization of space being developed in the United States is not subject to doubt--it has a clear-cut aggressive direction. This was pointed out by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev, speaking in Warsaw on 26 April: "Mankind is faced with the choice: will the unfavorable course of events be successfully corrected or will the danger of nuclear war increase? That danger is being intensified many times by U.S. military plans in space. No matter what their authors say or how they justify themselves, the essence of these plans is clear: to obtain the capability of delivering a nuclear first strike and delivering it with

impunity. Inasmuch as the United States and NATO categorically refused to follow the USSR's example and undertake not to be first to employ nuclear weapons, their intentions acquire an even more dangerous character.

"The development of weapons for the 'star wars' is just beginning, but it is already making the modern world feverish and leading to a destabilization of the entire system of international relations and to an even more acute political and military confrontation than at the present time."

The aggressive nature of the new American space doctrine also would be preserved if after establishing an ABM system the United States did not use its capabilities to launch missiles against the USSR and deliver a nuclear strike. The United States could use the very fact of possessing such a capability in the presence of a "space shield" to blackmail and bring pressure to bear on other countries, and above all on the Soviet Union.

It also should be borne in mind that the space weapons being designed in the United States can fully become a means for employing military force against those states which are incapable of developing appropriate means of counter-measures and protection.

It is impossible to be led astray by statements of the American administration that implementation of the "strategic defensive initiative" is limited to the scope of R&D and that this work allegedly does not bear for now any threat of the deployment of a comprehensive ABM system.

But who cannot see that the United States is spending billions of dollars on R&D not at all out of love for science and technical discoveries? Tests of components of the widescale ABM system which already are being conducted and planned by the Pentagon are directly intended for establishing those conditions where it would remain only to make the decision for practical deployment of appropriate means. They wish to bring the USSR face to face with the fact of the predetermined appearance of an all-encompassing ABM system in the United States in a short period of time. For this reason the reservations concerning "research" do not change the substance of the matter.

U.S. officials themselves also speak of the real danger of the American "strategic initiative" in space. Suffice it to turn, for example, to an interview published in the journal AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY with Lt Gen James Abrahamson, who has been given responsibility for implementing the "star wars" program. He declared in this interview that the work entrusted to him is advancing so quickly that the first tests of a space weapon can be conducted considerably earlier than planned, and in 1987 specifically. The general's revelations were repeated by Michael Burch, assistant U.S. secretary of defense (public affairs). He announced that beginning in 1987 it was planned to conduct experiments under the "star wars" program each year during two flights by reusable spacecraft. He clarified that during such experiments "the capabilities of detection, tracking and guidance to targets" in space were to be "tested."

Washington thus decided to discard its own ruse used at first to calm a public alarmed by the White House's intent to move the arms race into space. Not very long ago Washington was giving assurances that it was a question allegedly of inoffensive "scientific research and development" which was far from practical implementation. Now, however, it is announced that they can move into the stage of practical experiments in two years. With regard to the myth according to which the entire "star wars" program allegedly was nothing more than a trump in the Americans' hand for playing a diplomatic game, that essentially was dispelled by President R. Reagan himself. Speaking in the White House at a meeting with a group of scientists, he declared: "The strategic defense initiative is not a trump card at talks. It is a historic program in the interests of our national defense and in the interests of preserving peace throughout the world, and we intend to implement it."

The following statement by Under Secretary of Defense F. Ikle before the Senate Commission on Medium-Range Strategic and Nuclear Forces also is indicative: "The strategic defense initiative is not an alternative program in the backyards of defense efforts. It is a central one."

And so it is not a question of abstract preliminary research "just in case," so to speak, but a question of planned actions being carried out under a specific timetable, and even ahead of schedule.

As already noted, the persistent attempt of the American administration to shift the arms race into space is fraught with dangerous consequences. The authors of the "Count-Down to Space War" prepared by the Stockholm Research Institute (SIPRI) correctly emphasized that its consequence would be the fact that the United States and the USSR would begin one more spiral of the arms race. In their opinion, there would begin "not only an obvious, but also a costly competition in the area of lasers within the scope of antisatellite defense, and one of the retaliatory reactions on both sides would consist of a sharp increase in their offensive nuclear arsenals. This would assure a situation where some nuclear missiles would reach their targets despite the opposing ballistic missile defense. Thus lasers in reality could accelerate the race of nuclear arms without having made nuclear weapons obsolete."

Based on an analysis of the "star wars" program, American scientists with a worldwide reputation Hans Bethe, Richard Garwin, Kurt Gottfried and Henry Kendall concluded that "it is difficult to imagine a system more fraught with the appearance of disaster than the one requiring critical decisions in a matter of seconds, which is in itself untested and fragile, and which at the same time threatens the possibility of the other side's retaliation."

The viewpoint of such authoritative American figures as McGeorge Bundy, George Kennan, Robert McNamara and Gerard Smith also is known. In their words, "it is decisively impossible to ignore the fact that the 'star wars' do not promise increased security, but an indisputable and significant build-up both in offensive and defensive systems on both sides." They are convinced that "this is a recipe not for elimination or limitation of the threat stemming from nuclear weapons, but for a competition unlimited in expenditures, duration and danger."

That is the prospect which is inevitable. "If preparations for 'star wars' continue," emphasized M. S. Gorbachev, speaking in Warsaw, "we will be left with no other choice than to take retaliatory steps including of course a strengthening and improvement of offensive nuclear arms."

The Soviet Union proposes to block the path of arms into space and to solve this problem fundamentally without leaving any loopholes for militarization of outer space. Following its fundamental political course, it introduced a draft treaty in 1983 for prohibiting the use of force in outer space and from space with respect to Earth. This step also would presume in particular a total rejection of antisatellite weapons, including the destruction of such systems already in existence. In an attempt to facilitate the attainment of an understanding, the USSR unilaterally declared a moratorium on the placement of antisatellite weapons into space so long as other countries act in the very same manner.

The matter of preventing a militarization of space brooks no delay. In an attempt to assist this in every way, the Soviet Union introduced the question "Use of Outer Space Exclusively for Peaceful Purposes and for the Welfare of Mankind" to the agenda of the General Assembly's XXXIX Session as an important and urgent matter.

This initiative was a continuation of the USSR's consistent line toward preventing an arms race in space and eliminating the threat of nuclear war. The issue is that attack weapons of any kind--conventional, nuclear, laser, beam or any other--shall not be placed into space or deployed there, whether it be in manned or unmanned systems. Space weapons of any kinds of basing shall not be developed, tested or deployed for ballistic missile defense, as antisatellite weapons, or for use against targets on Earth or in the air. Such weapons which already have been developed shall be destroyed.

The use of force in space and from space against Earth, as well as from Earth against objects in space must be banned forever. The USSR proposes to come to an agreement on a radical solution to the question of preventing the militarization of space--the prevention and elimination of the entire class of space attack arms including space-based antisatellite and antimissile weapons, as well as any ground-based, air-based or sea-based weapons intended for destroying space objects.

An understanding to prohibit and eliminate entirely the class of space attack weapons lends itself fully to reliable and effective verification of the parties' observance of obligations. Verification already is facilitated by virtue of the fact that it is a question of a complete ban on development of such weapons and destruction of those few already developed.

Our country proposes that the USSR and United States introduce a moratorium on the development of space weapons and freeze strategic nuclear arsenals for the entire period of bilateral talks in Geneva. The goals by which the Soviet Union is guided here are clear and specific. They are a strengthening of general security, termination of the nuclear arms race, and keeping it out of space. Unfortunately the American side refuses to discuss the question of the

nonextension of the arms race to outer space at Geneva, in violation of a preliminary understanding. The U.S. administration responds with "no" at cosmic speed to the USSR's new peace initiatives.

Meanwhile it is completely obvious that it is impossible to consider questions of strategic nuclear arms and of medium-range nuclear weapons without considering questions of space and the nonmilitarization of outer space.

The White House's lack of desire to give up plans for militarization of space has become the "chief stumbling block" at the Geneva talks. This block has to be removed. Space must be preserved as a sphere of cooperation and not as an arena for a destructive arms race.

COPYRIGHT: IZDATELSTVO TSK KP LATVII. "KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII" 1985.

6904

CSO: 5200/1304

ARMS CONTROL

SPEECHES ASSAILING SDI AT WPC MARCH MEETING REPORTED

Editorial Introduction

Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE in English No 5, May 85 pp 2-3

[Text]

Session of the WPC Presidential Presidium

The words of the headline are taken from the Declaration adopted at the closing meeting of the session of the WPC Presidential Presidium which took place in Moscow on March 22-25. These lines reveal the content and tune of the important international forum which gathered together about 400 representatives of different political parties, trade unions, public organizations, mass antiwar and liberation movements, unions of women, youth and religious elements from 86 countries, many international organizations.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet sent a greeting to the session's representatives.

The plenary meetings heard speeches by prominent political and public figures from various countries, messengers from all continents.

Fruitful discussions were held in special commissions and regional meetings on the following themes: "Historical Importance of the 40th Anniversary of the Victory over Fascism", "Prevention of Outer Space Militarization", "Struggle Against Aggression and Intervention in Different Regions of the Planet", "Problems of Developing Countries".

The participants in the session adopted the documents—Declaration and Appeal to the peoples of the world.

Zhukov, Velikhov, Molina Speeches

Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE in English No 5, May 85 pp 6-8

[Excerpt]

Lately participants in some Western antiwar movements, said Yuri Zhukov, the SPC Chairman, in his speech at the session, put a question: why the Soviet Union and other socialist countries react so acutely on the so-called US "Space Defence Initiative"? That initiative envisages the creation of defensive not offensive weapons which, by the way, can appear only in the 21st century!

Doesn't that mean that the Soviet Union concentrating attention on the struggle against space militarization wants to divert the attention from the struggle for the reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons which already exist, in particular, of the medium-range weapons being deployed in Europe? Maybe the Soviet Union has already abandoned the idea of their destruction and wants to preserve those monstrous weapons for the fulfilment of its aggressive aims about which warn American leaders?

As for the struggle for the reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons in the long run, the assertions that we have lost or became less interested in it is a shameless lie. Not later than at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU held this March it was confirmed that our aim—complete destruction of nuclear weapons and full elimination of the threat of a nuclear war.

What we, peace champions, can and must do to resolve this problem without losing time for idle thinking?

First of all, I think it is necessary, using all possible things, to dispose the lie which is imprisoning now some participants in the antiwar movements who consider that the threat of war with the use of space weapons is the matter of a distant future and not actual. What we need now as air are publication of truthful information on the sinister plans, the information on the aggressive nature of "star wars"; meetings, conferences and symposiums with participation of specialists, and broad open discussions.

Further, we believe that it is necessary to show with new force that peoples are resolutely stepping up both against a war on earth and a war in

space. Deeply wrong are those who say that now when the Soviet-American talks has started and that their beginning is, undoubtedly, the great success of peace champions who long ago demanded the beginning of these talks!—we, allegedly, can take breath and wait till positive results are obtained.

No to waiting! No to silence! No to demobilizing moods! On the contrary, we must now double, treble, increase by ten times, the pressure demanding that the participants in the talks respecting the will of the peoples must conduct them in constructive spirit trying to achieve the speedy agreement obtained as a result of the talks between Andrei Gromyko and George Shultz on the subject and aim of these talks and on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security.

Let streets be full of demonstrations of opponents of the arms race on earth and in space. Let them send their messages to the participants in the talks demanding the fulfilment of the will of peoples—prevent the militarization of space and use space only for peaceful purposes. May the delegations of peace champions be sent to Geneva for meetings with the participants in the talks and for handing in to them such messages.

I think it will be correct if a delegation of the present session of the WPC Presidium is sent there first to hand in the decisions which we adopted here.

Academician Yevgeny VELIKHOV explained the USSR position on the problem of space militarization.

Plans to develop a space-based anti-missile defense system, he emphasized, constitute one of the most burning problems of our day. The year of 1985 is a special year which may become a turning point in the destiny of the world: it marks the 40th anniversary of the Victory over fascism and also the 40th anniversary of the dropping of the A-bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The present-day state of affairs in the world is such that, should we allow the deployment of one type of weapons in space, it is sure to be followed by another type and then still another. This will inevitably lead to a qualitatively

new round of the arms race—the arms race in space.

It is for this reason that groups of scientists in different countries were the first to take up a detailed study of the various aspects of the "star wars" programme and to explain them to the public at large. Among them were the Committee of the Soviet Scientists for Peace, Against Nuclear Threat (which has put out a special report on the subject and numerous publications), the Federation of the American Scientists, the Union of Concerned Scientists of the USA, and the Agency for Technology Assessment of the US Congress. Their conclusions can be summed up in the following way: plans to build an absolutely impenetrable spacebased anti-missile defence system are an illusion which cannot be supported by any modern scientific or technological concept. The expert conclusions based on an in-depth knowledge of the fundamental laws of nature and a comprehensive assessment of the situation in and prospects for the development of technology allow for no ambiguity or difference of opinion. They have been corroborated by forthright and convincing arguments.

Far from lessening the danger of a nuclear conflict, the "strategic defence initiative" aggravates it considerably.

This should, in the first place, be explained by the fact that even partial implementation of the "star wars" programme would in practice lead to the development of a first-strike weapon—its less ambitious but far more dangerous component. Specifically, the question at issue is the development of effective anti-satellite weapons, which would considerably undermine stability and the existing strategic balance and would spur the arms race still further.

Another dangerous aspect of the "star wars" programme is the fact that this movement towards developing a global antimissile defence system is a gross violation of the 1972 Treaty on Limiting the Anti-Missile Defence System which serves as a cornerstone of all subsequent arms limitation accords. In 1972, everybody hoped that the aforementioned treaty would be followed

by other similar agreements. But those hopes were not to be materialized. Let me stress again that the 1972 Treaty provides the groundwork for all further agreements in this field.

Third, further research and development of the "strategic defence initiative" in fact opens the "Pandorra box" as it were, and gives the green light to the development of all types of space weapons systems.

Even if some practical results are gained after ten years of "research and development" in the field of space-based antimissile system (which is very doubtful), a fair amount of scientific and technical potential will still be built up in developing both the so-called "defence systems" and new and quite real offensive weapons. Let me re-emphasize the main premise that a space-based anti-missile system is an illusion but even the initial stages of its development pose a grave danger.

First, it is extremely difficult to supervise and control the development of individual elements of a space-based anti-missile defence system. Second, in critical situations it is hard to rely on these elements, whereas their highest reliability is an indispensable condition. Third, individual elements of a space-based anti-missile defence system are exceedingly vulnerable, as they have easily perishable parts, the lack of which renders the entire system utterly inoperative.

Effective anti-satellite systems are being developed "under the blanket" of an anti-missile defence system, which jeopardizes the existence of vitally important satellites used for communication, supervision and control. Meanwhile the country's entire defence and security system is based on the existence of these satellites.

The development of an anti-satellite defence system, as the first stage in implementing the space-based anti-missile defence system programme, is, beyond doubt, a highly dangerous factor of destabilizing the existing strategic balance, fragile as it is.

According to the US administration's plans, the spacebased anti-missile system, which is being developed on a lar-

ge scale, should have the "police functions" that would enable the United States to "exercise control" throughout the world. Let it be recalled that the US harboured similar illusions in 1946, and the results are only too well known.

This is why it is important already now, without delay, to insist on and work towards:

- precluding militarization of space,
- adhering to the principles and provisions of the 1972 Treaty on Limiting the Anti-Missile Defence System,
- banning "research" within the framework of the "strategic defence initiative".

President of the Venezuelan Peace Council Ricardo Molina told the session that deployment of weapons in space is direct threat to the countries of the "Third World".

Not long ago an American scientist, military specialist, said that the USA was building a space shield to unsheathe a nuclear sword, i.e., to deliver the first nuclear strike and remain unpunished. The star dreams of President Reagan and his supporters—let cities of other states be burning under US missile strikes while the American territory remains intact. But that will never happen. American cities will inevitably

be destroyed together with Soviet, Polish, Hungarian and German cities. The trouble will reach the most remote neutral countries and snowfalls don't recognize borders.

A reference should be made to the danger which carries the deployment of space weapons for the "Third World" countries too. They, naturally, will be unable to build anti-space systems and will be quite defenceless and left on the mercy of the Pentagon and CIA, which with the aid of space systems can destroy manpower, depots with ammunition and fuel, put out of action communication systems and power stations. In other words, they can use the most sophisticated and almost detective-proof means to perpetrate a pitiless aggression against any developing country.

International community is firmly against the escalation of the space arms race. Let President Reagan know that his "heroic dream" concerning "star wars" will be a nightmare for the whole of mankind and that nuclear weapon, land- or spacebased, is not a weapon but a means for suicide. Only ignoramuses and maniacs don't understand that.

CSO: 5200/1313

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

1945 DEBATES OVER UN SECURITY COUNCIL VETO RIGHTS RECALLED

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 26, Jun 85 pp 18-19

[Text]

On June 26, forty years ago, the representatives of 50 countries affixed their signatures to the fundamental document of the world's most representative organization.

The San Francisco conference marked the concluding stage of the work done to draft the new organization's fundamental organizational principles and define its purposes and objectives. While the war was still on, the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and Britain had, on a Soviet initiative, conducted negotiations at Dumbarton Oaks (August 21—September 28, 1944) where they worked out proposals for the establishment of a universal international security organization, later endorsed by China. This wide-ranging document later formed the groundwork of the future U.N. Charter.

At Dumbarton Oaks the allies succeeded in settling most of their differences. Not all of them, though. No consensus was reached, for instance, on the voting procedure in the Security Council—the very problem on whose solution the equality and cooperation of the main powers of the anti-Hitler coalition in the future international security organization depended.

The Soviet Union wanted a voting procedure based on the principle of the unanimity of the Council's permanent members on all questions under discussion. The U.S. and British representatives insisted that the vote of a Security Council member involved in a dispute would not be counted. In other words, they provided in advance for

the possibility of a group of states dictating their will to one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

After the Dumbarton Oaks conference the discussion of this question continued—chiefly between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.—through diplomatic channels. Later, the allied powers returned to it at their Crimea Conference (February 4-11, 1945) where a compromise version suggested by President Franklin Roosevelt was agreed upon. Its underlying principle was that of the great powers' unanimity in solving all fundamental problems. It was decided at the Yalta Conference that the founding conference of the United Nations would open on April 25, 1945, in San Francisco to establish an international organization dedicated to the maintenance of peace and security.

In the spring of 1945 the front kept rolling westward. The Third Reich was shrinking. Street fighting in Berlin... The red flag over the Reichstag... The war in Europe was coming to an end.

At that time calls for stopping cooperation with the Soviet Union sounded ever more often in the U.S. and British ruling quarters. This cooperation no longer appeared so necessary as it had in the early years of the war against Nazi Germany. In his memoirs, Winston Churchill later wrote with the utmost frankness that the destruction of Germany's military power had brought with it a fundamental change in the relations with Soviet Russia. On April 12, 1945, President Franklin Roosevelt passed away. His successor, Harry Tru-

man, shifted the emphasis in U.S. foreign policy to anti-Sovietism and anti-communism.

Under the circumstances, the convocation of the San Francisco conference was of great political importance, on the one hand; on the other hand, the increased tension in relations between the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition lent extreme acuteness to the discussions at the conference.

The conference opened in San Francisco's Opera House on the warm sunny day of April 25, 1945, at 4.30 p.m. The following day it started discussing the general problems connected with the establishment of a world security organization and with its draft Charter worked out at Dumbarton Oaks.

The conference brought together representatives from states on various continents with different social systems and different economic development standards. Their approaches to the solution of postwar problems differed, too, but they had one aspiration in common: the war which had brought the world such untold suffering must never be repeated. The idea of creating an effective international security organization figured in all the speeches made at the conference. At the same time, there were strong indications that the leading Western powers wanted to make the future organization a means of establishing their hegemony in the postwar world.

Four commissions subdivided into 12 committees were set up to discuss certain points of the proposals adopted at Dumbarton Oaks and to look into some other questions. They were to consider amendments and to draft the appropriate articles of the Charter. Thirty-six states submitted some 1,200 remarks on and amendments to the original text of the future organization's fundamental document. As a result, the "committee" period of the conference took much longer than planned and only came to a close on June 20. Many of the provisions worked out at Dumbarton Oaks were amplified and revised.

A preamble, not found in the draft, was added to the Charter: "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm the faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human

person ... have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

In Chapter I the purposes and principles of the organization were set forth in more detail, and Chapter II of the Charter, concerning the U.N. members, was actually rewritten. Most amendments and remarks—but, unfortunately, not all of them—were of a businesslike character, had the aim of improving the organizational structure of the future security organization, and stemmed from a sincere desire to set up the most effective security system possible.

The conference saw heated discussion over the questions connected with the General Assembly and the Security Council. In a situation where a change in U.S. and British policy was becoming ever more clearly pronounced, it took the Soviet delegation a great deal of effort, restraint and perseverance to prevent the adoption of decisions unacceptable to the Soviet Union and to keep intact the essence of the proposals adopted at Dumbarton Oaks.

The New Times editors have asked Professor Alexei Roshchin, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, a participant in the San Francisco conference, to share his reminiscences.

Alexei Roshchin Recalls

The voting procedure in the Security Council was the most important question involved in working out the U.N. Charter. The Security Council was to be the only United Nations' body vested with the right to adopt vital decisions on economic and diplomatic sanctions, combat actions and other important measures. The U.S.A. and Britain held the opinion that a Security Council permanent member involved in a dispute or a conflict should not exercise the veto. They sought to restrict the Soviet Union's right and its chances of opposing the attempts to push through the Security Council decisions running counter to the aims and principles of the U.N. Charter. Washington planned to use the United Nations as a tool of its international policy. It hoped to gain commanding positions in the United Nations.

At that time the U.S.A. and Britain were not too emphatic about

the Security Council permanent members' vetoing power. They hoped they would always command an obedient majority in the Council and in other U.N. bodies. However, the U.S. and British delegations could not openly oppose the voting procedure adopted in the Crimea. It was British dominions, some Latin American countries and the Philippines which tried to push through changes in this procedure. Australian Foreign Minister Herbert Evatt, for instance, attacked the voting procedure in the Security Council adopted in the Crimea. He insisted that the veto should be exercised only as regards the decisions to use, in the U.N. framework, economic and diplomatic sanctions and military action against an aggressor. As for peaceful means of settling conflicts, Evatt suggested that the Council's decisions on these matters be adopted by a majority of any seven countries' votes, without the Council's permanent members using the right to a veto. Latin American countries (Peru, Colombia, Cuba and others) went even further. They demanded that all U.N. members should enjoy equal rights in the Security Council, and objected to the veto as such.

It took a lot of effort to counter the proposals of the West which was trying to change the nature of the future organization and to direct its activity against the interests of the U.S.S.R. and other independent states.

As Committee II/1 of the conference, dealing with the procedure and structure of the General Assembly, discussed the appointment of a U.N. Secretary-General, Australia and Uruguay suggested that the Security Council abandon the rule of the unanimity of the Council's permanent members when accepting recommendations on that question. This proposal ran counter to the Crimea Conference's decision on the voting procedure in the Security Council. Nevertheless, Congressman Sol Bloom, the U.S. representative on the committee, supported the proposal right away.

If accepted, this proposal would have had negative consequences. The Soviet Union's say in forming the Secretariat, one of the U.N. main bodies, would have been minimized or even nullified—in the early years

of the U.N., at least. At that time the U.S.A. had an obvious advantage over us in all the U.N. bodies, the Security Council included, and would have been able to recommend any person of its choice to the post of Secretary-General by a majority of seven votes in the Council and contrary to the Soviet Union's will.

That same night I reported to Andrei Gromyko, the head of our delegation, on the situation at the Committee as regards the Secretary-General appointment issue. Thanks to his persistent efforts, Andrei Gromyko succeeded in getting Committee II/1 to revoke its decision and adopt the Secretary-General appointment procedure agreed upon earlier. In accordance with this procedure, the Security Council's recommendation for that post had to be adopted unanimously by the permanent members.

The U.S. delegation then claimed that Sol Bloom had "made a mistake." Hardly likely. After all, he had two advisers (out of the dozens the American delegation had included) who could not possibly have failed to know the decisions previously reached on this issue. In fact, the U.S.A. was seeking to undermine the principle of the unanimity of the Security Council's permanent members in appointing the Secretary-General and thus to belittle the role the U.S.S.R. had to play in the future organization.

Here is another example. On Committee II/2 (which dealt with the political functions and competence of the General Assembly) the U.S.A. was represented by Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a Republican and an opponent of Franklin Roosevelt's line of cooperation with the U.S.S.R. It was on his prompting that Bolivia's representative submitted a proposal that the U.N. General Assembly be given the right to revise international agreements concluded by states.

The American-Bolivian agreement ran counter to the provisions of the draft U.N. Charter drawn up and agreed upon at Dumbarton Oaks. Nevertheless, Vandenberg clamoured for its adoption. The Soviet delegation was resolutely against it, and had the support of the French, Czechoslovak, Peruvian, Colombian and Chilean delegations

in this. As a result, the proposal that the U.N. General Assembly be given the right to revise international agreements was defeated.

Herein, I think, lies the special significance of the San Francisco conference. The Soviet Union succeeded in foiling attempts to make the U.N. a means of establishing Washington's and London's political and economic domination in the world, of bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet Union in matters of postwar policy. At the U.S.S.R.'s insistence, the organization was based on the principles which prevented the possibility of it being used by any permanent member state of the Security Council against another.

The signing of the Charter began in the morning of June 26. The conference met for its final session in the evening of that same day.

Addressing the session, Andrei Gromyko pointed out that, despite the difficulties and differences of opinion between individual delegations on certain points, the conference had succeeded in overcoming the main difficulties and in fulfilling its objectives.

The four decades since the establishment of the United Nations have borne

out the viability of its Charter. The importance of this document is hard to overestimate. Enshrined in it are such important universally recognized democratic principles as the sovereign equality of all U.N. member states, the impermissibility of aggression or the threat of force in international relations, the nations' right to self-determination, and the respect for human rights irrespective of race, sex, language and religion.

N. ZHOLKVER

CSO; 1812/300

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN USE OF ANARCTICA LAUDED

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 26, Jun 85 pp 28-30

[Article by Vyacheslav Markin]

[Text]

Since the Antarctic Treaty was signed 25 years ago, the sixth continent has become a true proving ground for peaceful international cooperation. For the first time an agreement banning hostilities and rivalry between states, wars as a means of solving disputes, or any type of military preparations is being realized on an entire continent.

On October 15, 1959, a special conference opened in Washington. It was convened by 12 countries who had worked together during the International Geophysical Year (IGY) in Antarctica. The subject under discussion at the conference was this sixth continent, discovered only 165 years ago, and more than three centuries after Christopher Columbus had discovered America.

The conference was necessary because a number of countries had been trying to lay claim to one or another part of the frozen continent and serious disputes on its "division" threatened. Hence the importance of the treaty that was signed on December 1, 1959 (to date 32 countries have joined it). One of the articles of the treaty says that "Antarctica shall be used for peaceful purposes only. There shall be prohibited, inter alia, any measures of a military nature, such as the establishment of military bases and fortifications, the carrying out of military manoeuvres, as well as the testing of any type of weapons."

**Captain Cook
was wrong**

It is thought that the first people to reach the Antarctic continent were the ancient inhabitants of New Zealand, ancestors of the Maoris, a contemporary Polynesian people. As legend has it, a

man by the name of Hu-te-Rangiora found himself in the turbulent Antarctic waters where he saw "white cliffs, their peaks piercing the heavens." As calculated by historians, this journey took place some time around 650 A.D.

In January 1773 the Antarctic Circle was crossed by an Englishman, Captain James Cook. The following year he reached the record latitude of 70°10', where he encountered pack ice. At that time he confidently declared that nobody would ever dare to go further south than he had, that the lands that might lie to the south would never be explored.

About half a century later this was disproved by the Russian expedition headed by Faddei Bellingshausen and Mikhail Lazarev on the sloops Vostok and Mirny. They succeeded in reaching, as Lazarev wrote, "extremely tall continental ice." The date was January 28, 1820, and they had discovered the South Polar continent, Antarctica.

In 1899 ten men, headed by the Norwegian explorer Carsten Borchgrevink landed on Cape Adare. They were the first people who ventured to winter on the Antarctic continent, and they established that life was possible there.

At the Sixth International Geographical Congress, held in 1895 in London, the German geophysicist Georg von Neumayer called on scientists of different lands to pool their efforts in the exploration of Antarctica.

Expeditions set off one after another: British, German, Swedish, French, Norwegian, British again... On December 15, 1911, the Norwegian Roald Amundsen reached the South Pole, followed on January 18, 1912, by the Englishman Robert Scott.

Then, alas, a struggle began for the division of Antarctica and its adjacent waters and lands. At the beginning of this century Britain seized the Antarctic Macquarie and Prince Edward islands; France, Norway, Australia, Argentina and Germany all claimed territories in Antarctica.

A series of expeditions was launched in 1946 by U.S. Navy. Who knows—perhaps the icebound continent might have become a battlefield if it had not been for the agreement on conducting worldwide research into complex natural processes within the framework of the International Geophysical Year and international geophysical cooperation programme (1957-59).

This stupendous scientific undertaking, its scale hitherto unknown in the history of mankind, undoubtedly fostered a change in the attitude towards Antarctica as an object of territorial dispute. It turned out that knowledge of the nature of Antarctica was imperative for the solution of many global scientific problems, that this ice-covered continent played a specific part in the Earth's natural system. During the IGY a whole continent became an immense international research laboratory. The Soviet Union took a very active part in this work.

SAE: From the first to the thirtieth

Long before the IGY, the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, with the participation of Ivan Papanin, a famous Arctic explorer, discussed plans for a Soviet Antarctic Expedition (SAE). Mikhail Somov, Hero of the Soviet Union, who had headed the drifting research station Severny Polyus-2 (North Pole-2), headed the expedition.

On January 14, 1956, the diesel-electric ship Ob approached the ice barrier in the area of Haswell Island. Here, on the coast that was soon to be named Pravda Coast, work was begun on building the Soviet expedition's base—the Mirny observatory. Since then a SAE has been sent out to the sixth continent every year.

The Soviet researchers agreed to the American plan to establish a base on the geographic South Pole and to explore the least accessible area of the continent—the South Magnetic Pole (SMP), as well as a pole of relative inaccessibility at the point farthest from the coast.

The first inland expedition (April-May 1956) set up the Pionerskaya Sta-

tion. Four men (including a meteorologist, Alexander Gusev, and a glaciologist, Leonid Dolgushin) wintered for the first time on the mountainous plateau of Antarctica. The following year the leader of the second SAE, Alexei Treshnikov, who had organized the drifting North Pole-3 station, sent a train of powerful tractors and sledges to the SMP. It was no easy matter to cover 1,500 kilometres of icy wilderness, with the temperature below minus 60°C and a continuous head wind. On this route two intermediate stations were built—Komsomolskaya and Vostok-1, and also the observatory Vostok, which is 1,410 kilometres from Mirny and 3,420 metres above sea level. Year-round work on the continental stations Vostok, Sovetskaya and Komsomolskaya was organized by the third SAE under the leadership of E. Tolstikov. The Earth's pole of cold was discovered, where the temperature of the air was recorded as minus 89°C.

By the beginning of the IGY the Soviet Union was already conducting observations on four Antarctic stations. Mirny had become a unique global weather centre: a daily weather map for the entire Southern Hemisphere was compiled there. Stations belonging to the U.S.A., Australia, Argentina, Norway—in all, to 12 countries—worked in close contact with the Soviet station. The equally severe conditions, the realization that their work was following a coordinated common programme for the benefit of science and humanity—all this drew the researchers closer together. Their relations were based on mutual understanding.

In 1958 something like 900 people wintered on 43 stations. Of these 185 were Soviet researchers; 18 men lived and conducted scientific research on the Amundsen-Scott station established by the United States at the geographic South Pole.

Today Antarctica is constantly inhabited by 600-700 people. Over the 86 years since the first party landed, over 20,000 people have wintered there. These include men who have been there 5-6 times.

In the summer, when dozens of ships force their way through the ice floes of the Antarctic seas, when the snow-covered wasteland is furrowed by tractor-and-sleigh trains and air routes run through the cloudless Antarctic sky Antarctica is visited by four to five thousand people simultaneously.

In March of this year the 30th SAE arrived in Antarctica, bringing about 600 people.

International Projects

Since the time of the IGY an exchange of researchers between the stations of different countries has become customary. Joint reports and articles disclosing the mysteries of the icebound continent have been prepared.

A Soviet weatherman Vladimir Rastorguyev (of the first SAE) wintered at the American McMurdo station, while an American researcher stayed at Mirny. In 1960 the glaciologist Sveneld Yevfeyev participated in a journey to the South Pole, to the American Amundsen-Scott station. Later this scientific base on the geographic South Pole was visited by Igor Zotikov, a glaciologist-thermophysicist who had worked for a year at the American McMurdo base. He measured the depth distribution of ice temperatures in order to find confirmation of his long-conceived "fantastic idea" of the possibility that melted snow might exist under the enormous ice shield. Thanks to work carried out together with American researchers, clear indications of this, at first glance incredible, phenomenon, were found. Then the Americans invited the Soviet glaciologist to take part in the Ross Ice Shelf project. So he went to Antarctica again (for the sixth time) to work on a gigantic floating glacier.

The Antarctic Ocean surrounding the frozen continent has been the object of joint Soviet-American exploration since 1974. Academician Alexei Treshnikov put forward the idea of parallel complex investigations in both Polar oceans of the earth—the Arctic and the Antarctic. Thus appeared the programme Polar Experiment (POLEX), which is divided into POLEX-North (in the Arctic and North Atlantic waters) and POLEX-South (in Antarctica). The processes taking place in the Polar oceans interested American scientists, too, so contacts were established between the researchers of both countries and the investigations began to follow a coordinated programme; a regular exchange of information between the two sides was established. This scientific cooperation has now been going on for more than ten years.

A most important international project is BIOMASS (Biological Investigation of Marine Antarctic Systems and Stocks of the planctonic crustacean

that is widely known as "krill"). The krill reserves are very great: up to a hundred million tons a year may be extracted from the seas. However, it must not be forgotten that this miniature crustacean is an important link in the ecological chain of the Antarctic Ocean. Depletion of the krill resources may lead to a crisis in the unique Antarctic ecological system.

Antarctica has neither forests nor rivers and there are no geographical zones except one: ice. Everything is white. And glacial domes rise to 4,000 metres. However, there are mountain ranges with sharp crests, an active volcano, "oases" of land free of ice, lakes in which the temperature at the bottom is as much as plus 25°C, and penguin colonies...

Nowhere on earth does the atmospheric temperature fall so low as it does here—down to almost minus 90°C. Nowhere else are there such hurricane winds that blow with such constancy. The most fearful thing on the "land" is, probably, the blizzards. In their "white darkness" both ground and sky vanish, and one unwary step aside could mean a step into an abyss from which there is no return. This is death in close proximity to a warm house, the house that is somewhere right here, but just try and find it amidst the vortex of snow. The wind finally abates and the sky opens up to view. It is impossible to tear one's gaze away from it—when it is vividly painted in pure sunset colours, or sprinkled with bright stars or dabbled with cold splashes of the aurora polaris.

The explorers of Antarctica have to work under very difficult conditions. Here is only one example: on March 9 of this year the expeditionary-research vessel Mikhail Somov, named after our well-known Polar explorer, arrived in the area of the Russkaya station in the Pacific sector. It was to bring in a new wintering party and take off the old one, and also to unload and send over to the station fuel and provisions. The unloading operations had already started when a fierce storm suddenly broke out on March 15. The wind howled at 70 metres a second and thick ice floes blocked the way of the Somov.

Captain Valentin Rodchenko managed to bring his diesel-electric vessel out of the dangerous zone full of icebergs, but soon the Somov found itself in the centre of a vast zone of pack

ice. Trapped by it, the vessel began to drift in a southwesterly direction. Some of the crew and researchers were transferred to other SAE vessels. Seventy-seven people were taken off the Mikhail Somov by helicopters. The remaining 53 are waging a courageous fight for their ship and are at the same time continuing with their research work. The icebreaker Vladivostok has been sent to the rescue of the Mikhail Somov.

Mankind has learned a great deal in the past two decades about the only uninhabited—in the generally accepted sense—continent of our planet.

The dimensions of its ice "cap" have been established: its area is 14 million square kilometres, the length of its perimeter is 30,000 kilometres, and its 24 million to 30 million cubic kilometres of ice contain 90 per cent of all of the earth's fresh water. The utilization of these resources would help to solve the water-supply problem in such arid regions as the Arabian Peninsula and the Horn of Africa. There have been proposals to transport icebergs to these areas from Antarctica.

Unsuccessful attempts have already been made to deliver icebergs to the Northern Hemisphere. In one case the iceberg simply capsize and all the plans for its transportation had to be abandoned.

The geological structure of Antarctica has been explored and it has been established that once it was connected with Australia, Africa and South America forming one continent, Gondwana, which broke up 50 million to 30 million years ago. Some 30 million years ago a break occurred between Antarctica and Australia. The circulating Antarctic current, the mightiest stream

in the entire World Ocean (it involves the water down to the very bottom), is a powerful barrier that lets no warmth get through to the icebound continent.

These cold waters protect the ice shield from destruction; an extremely high rise in the temperature would be needed to melt this ice. If the Antarctic ice were to turn into water, the level of the World Ocean would rise by 60 metres, flooding coastal territories over an area of no less than 20,000,000 square kilometres. The colossal source of cold on this planet would vanish and a far-reaching reconstruction of its entire natural system would take place. Such changes would scarcely be beneficial to humanity.

Annually several thousand people from different lands cross the Antarctic Circle. They are members of wintering parties, workers from expeditionary detachments arriving just for the summer field season, whalers and krill catchers, and also tourists. Today the population of Antarctica is termed "transient" by demographers. However, certain scientists are already speaking of future Antarctic cities that will be inhabited not only by researchers.

In time people will launch the economic development of the natural wealth of this continent. Signs of oil have been found in its depths, as well as of coal, iron, and many rare metals. It is not simple, and at present still economically inexpedient, to organize their industrial extraction. But the time will come when a mining industry will appear in Antarctica. Practical use will also be found for its resources—the enormous stores of ice and cold.

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

VNESHTORGBANK CHAIRMAN ON CREDIT ASPECTS OF EAST-WEST TRADE

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 27, Jul 85 pp 25-27

[Interview with Yuri Ivanov, chairman of the Board of Directors of Vneshtorgbank: "East-West Trade: Credit Aspects"]

[Text]

New Times: What is the role played by monetary-credit relations in the U.S.S.R.'s economic ties with Western countries?

Ivanov: For the U.S.S.R., international monetary-credit relations as a whole, and with the industrially developed capitalist states in particular, are neither an independent nor a leading sphere of interstate economic relations. This does not mean, however, that the state of our monetary-credit relations with the West has no significance for Soviet foreign trade. For the financing of this trade in the required volumes, for the necessary periods of time and on favourable terms is an important factor in expanding cooperation between business partners. And, conversely, the absence of financing or offers of financing on uncompetitive terms creates obstacles to an expansion of trade.

Credit relations between the U.S.S.R. and the West in terms both of their scale and also of the forms and methods of financing reached their peak in the 1960s and 1970s. The granting of credits to the Soviet Union by Western banks was never an expression of any special attitude towards us on their part. For us, too, the credits were not an end in itself. It was a commercial necessity for both sides, wishing, as they did, to develop mutually advantageous economic ties. This need was dictated, among other things, by the growing share in the international trade turnover of machinery and equipment, complete production lines and

often even whole industrial enterprises. The sale of such goods with the backing of medium- and long-term credits has become standard practice because of the length of time needed for manufacture, delivery, construction and recoupment. So for the exporter, credit backing has become an important element of the competitiveness of his products. It is not by chance, therefore, that the share of medium- and long-term crediting in the sale of machinery and equipment on the world capitalist market today amounts to 80-85 and sometimes even 100 per cent of the commodity's cost. The role of credits is especially important in trading in costly complete plants. And it is precisely this type of equipment that the Soviet Union mainly buys from capitalist countries.

Using credits, Soviet foreign trade organizations have purchased equipment for many branches of the national economy. Existing enterprises in the chemical industry were modernized and new ones built, in particular for the output of mineral fertilizers. New capacities were put into service at iron and steel enterprises and big automobile plants such as the Volga and Kama works were built. The existence of favourable financial conditions made it possible substantially to increase the volume of our trade with the industrially developed capitalist countries. Thus, our trade with these countries has grown more than 20 times since the early 1960s.

The development of cooperation in the field of crediting plays a special part in expanding large-scale cooperation on a long-term basis. I refer not so much to conventional—albeit big—commercial deals between Soviet organizations and Western firms, as to operations transcending the framework of traditional foreign trade exchanges, such as industrial cooperation and deals on a buy-back basis. Their expansion presupposes a vigorous use both of internal and external sources of financing.

It is worth stressing here that, despite the importance of external economic ties for our national economy, imports from the industrially developed Western states and the credits financing them are by no means determining factors in the U.S.S.R.'s social and economic development. The cost of our imports from the West amounts to about 1.5 per cent of our gross social product, while Western credits cannot even be compared to our internal capital investments.

It should also be borne in mind that the U.S.S.R. is not only a purchaser, but also an exporter of various types of machinery and equipment. This means that it also grants credits to other countries. Furthermore, if we count all the credits granted by the Soviet Union to its foreign partners, the ratio between the credits we get and those we grant shows that we belong in the category of net creditors, that on the whole we grant more credits than we get.

New Times: Capitalism's monetary-financial system has been going through an acute crisis in the past couple of decades. In the 1980s the main cause of its instability was the "flight to the dollar," the pumping into the U.S.A. of capital from other countries as a result of the excessively high bank rates and the exchange rate of the American dollar. Do these processes have any effect on the U.S.S.R.'s credit relations with the capitalist countries?

Ivanov: The chronic ailments of capitalism's monetary system do indirectly affect the Soviet Union's trade interests. As an active participant in international economic exchange, the Soviet Union is interested in a stabilization of the situation on the money and credit markets. We are also interested in the development of international contacts in the monetary-credit sphere on the basis of equality, mutual advantage,

non-interference in each other's internal affairs and without any discrimination whatsoever.

Now, if we are to speak of the influence of the monetary-credit instability, in particular of the "dollar rush," on our monetary positions, it is not substantial. The U.S.S.R. has a reliable means of protecting itself against negative phenomena in the monetary and credit system of the West. This is the state monetary monopoly that forms the basis of the activities of Vneshtorgbank and is an inalienable component of the state monopoly on external economic activity.

The U.S.S.R.'s international monetary-credit relations on the whole, and with the Western countries in particular, are based on the principle of the planned balancing of external economic activities. The state concentrates in its hands the monetary resources and can therefore offset temporary losses by taking necessary measures in its trade or monetary policy. Not a single capitalist state has such possibilities. It is also quite important that the sharpening trade, economic, monetary and credit contradictions and the rivalry of the three centres of modern capitalism are prompting the business circles of each to search for ways of cooperating with the Soviet Union, which has the reputation of a reliable trade partner.

New Times: This brings us to the question of the prospects for the development of our monetary and credit relations with the West.

Ivanov: The U.S.S.R. has always been in favour of strengthening its economic relations with all foreign partners, including the developed capitalist states. We proceed from the premise that the successful economic, scientific and technological development of any state objectively presupposes the utilization of the advantages of the international division of labour. And this leads to an expansion and deepening of economic exchanges between countries with different social systems. In turn, this facilitates the strengthening of trust and international security. Such is the strategic basis of our approach to the development of East-West business ties. The consistency of this approach is convincingly proved by the expansion of trade with those industrial capitalist states which show their interest in trade with deeds. Thus, the

volume of the U.S.S.R.'s trade with such countries has grown from 31.6 billion rubles in 1980 to 40.9 billion rubles in 1984, or by almost 30 per cent. Last year alone our foreign trade turnover with the West rose by 6.5 per cent. Our cooperation in the monetary-credit sphere, which for more than 60 years now has been the function of Vneshtorgbank, is developing on the basis of this mutually advantageous and dynamic business exchange.

While consistently adhering to the line of expanding and deepening monetary and credit ties, we cannot accept the attempts of a number of Western countries to solve their financial problems at the expense of others. Alas, examples of this are numerous. In order to attract foreign investments the United States has grossly inflated its credit rates in recent years. The developing countries are the first to suffer from the high cost of international credit. At the same time the Reagan Administration's monetary and financial policy has hit the U.S.A.'s West European partners as well, and they have repeatedly expressed their displeasure over the excessively high bank rates.

Another example is the agreement between the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's member states on the terms for granting export credits—the so-called "credit consensus." The United States here, too, was the initiator and driving force. This agreement provides for unified interest rates for export credits that place many recipients in obviously unfavourable conditions when concluding foreign trade deals.

In trying to justify the raising by Western banks of their interest rates on export credits the United States pleads the need to reduce state-subsidized export in order to ease international competition. But in conditions when the international market of capital depends greatly on the foreign policy of a particular country, the very term "subsidizing" lends itself to different interpretations. For the artificial jacking-up of the cost of credit by increasing bank rates, as in the United States, can also be portrayed as "subsidizing" the national economy at the expense of foreign capital.

By insisting on the preservation of high interest rates on export credits, especially in the currency of states that

are experiencing economic difficulties, the United States undermines the positions of its trade rivals. This applies above all to France, Italy and Britain whose commodities have become considerably less competitive on the world capitalist market. By means of the "credit consensus" the United States also hopes to undermine the positions of its rivals in the markets of the socialist countries.

It goes without saying that this politization of international business cooperation, including in the monetary-financial sphere, cannot but affect East-West trade. If we are to speak of its prospects, it must be said that they will depend largely on the readiness of the West to maintain credit relations with socialist countries that are free of discrimination, on an equal and mutually advantageous basis.

Real prospects for expanding trade, monetary and credit ties between the Soviet Union and foreign countries now exist. The drafting of plans for the U.S.S.R.'s economic and social development in the 12th five-year-plan period and the subsequent period is nearing completion. These plans offer great possibilities for cooperation in the development of the agro-industrial complex, chemistry and petrochemistry, light industry, machine building, electronics, and other fields. Our Western partners, including the United States, have lately shown noticeably greater interest in removing the barriers standing in the way of expanding business contacts. The future will show if this is a transient interest or an indication of a serious desire to expand business ties.

New Times: Voicing the opinion of business circles, the Western press has noted the substantial consolidation of the U.S.S.R.'s monetary positions in the past two years. What is the reason for this and what is your forecast for the future?

Ivanov: Before answering I should like to narrow the question. True enough, there have been assertions lately in the Western press that the monetary and financial position of the U.S.S.R. has "substantially strengthened." But it should be known to the Western press and the business circles whose views it expresses that the U.S.S.R.'s solvency and its reputation as a trading partner has never been in question. We have always observed our payment commitments. The strength of our monetary

positions is based on the constant strengthening of the national economy, an expansion of the scale of our external economic ties and their diversification. They rest on the sound foundation of planning and the imperative observance of the principle of balancing our accounts in foreign trade and other types of economic relations with foreign countries.

In recent years the consolidation of the Soviet Union's monetary position has been enhanced by the policy of making the most rational use of our monetary resources, reducing the import of those commodities, the production of which we are organizing ourselves, and making our exports more competitive by utilizing the latest technology and taking account of supply and demand. These factors are of long-term nature because they reflect the policy of intensifying our economy as a whole. It is a matter of major importance that, while having a mighty export potential and big monetary reserves, the Soviet Union is also a leading gold-mining country. So the U.S.S.R.'s monetary and financial position has always been firm and will remain so.

Still, early in the 1980s, a propaganda campaign was launched in the bourgeois press with the aim of sowing doubt among businessmen about the U.S.S.R.'s solvency by circulating a lot of innuendoes about its "financial difficulties." It should be stated categorically: these contentions reflect the striving of certain circles in the West to engage in wishful thinking and are totally unfounded.

Monetary-financial difficulties cannot arise when foreign trade is balanced from year to year and, moreover, amounts to a comparatively small part of the gross social product, when there is no budget deficit and the economy develops on a planned basis. And we can be proud that the Soviet Union is able to ensure conditions of economic development that depend little on the ups and downs of the world economic situation, whereas—many of our Western "critics" must admit that—such

conditions are absent in their own countries, even though they may be economically very powerful.

I should also like to draw attention to the source of the rumours about the U.S.S.R.'s "financial difficulties." They began just when the opponents of détente started a large-scale campaign against it, including on the issue of East-West trade. Conservative politicians came to power in a number of capitalist states. It was in these conditions that the decision was taken to politicize monetary-credit relations with the socialist countries, as I have already mentioned. Inventions about the U.S.S.R.'s "financial difficulties" and big debt to the West, about an acute shortage of hard currency to purchase modern technology, etc., were put to use as "arguments" designed to substantiate the scaling down of these relations.

It is clearly no accident, either, that most often these contentions are first made across the ocean and only then picked up by the West European press. It is worth pointing out here that the credit relations of Vneshtorgbank with American banks have long been stagnant. So of everybody, American bankers have the least reason for concern. The obvious conclusion is that by this method—strange, to say the least—certain quarters in the United States are showing "concern" for the interests of Western Europe and Japan. On the other hand, if reports have appeared lately in the Western press about the "consolidation of the U.S.S.R.'s financial positions" and even "substantially," this may be a sign that the former unconstructive policy is being revised and, evidently, also substantially. If that is the case, the United States should first of all draw a lesson from the mistakes of the recent past and take practical steps to normalize its monetary and credit relations with the Soviet Union.

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGIANS, MARXISTS CONFER ON PEACE MOVEMENT

Moscow NAUKA I RELIGIYA in Russian No. 5, May 85 pp 55-56

[Article by V. Matveyev, IZVESTIYA political observer: "The Dialogue in Hamburg"]

[Text] It is impossible to imagine the ranks of participants in the antiwar movement today without religious figures and organizations which consider it their duty to defend the ideals of peace as part of the broad coalition of forces active in this noble sphere, which is vitally important for mankind.

K.U. Chernenko made the following statement in a message to E. Post (USA) and (K. Totu) (Hungary), co-chairmen of the consultative meeting of representatives of Christian churches: "We have always advocated and continue to advocate close cooperation with all peace-loving forces on the planet, including religious groups, which, in our opinion, can play a significant role in ridding mankind of the nuclear threat."¹

Guided by these motives, representatives of the public and of the clergy in our nation are participating along with foreign theologians and Marxist scholars in the "Dialogue on Peace" international symposiums.² The first such meetings took place at the beginning of the 70's and have been held on a regular basis since then. The last one was held from 6 to 9 December 1984 in Hamburg in a building at the Catholic Academy.

Professor Yu.A. Zamoshkin, the Archbishop of Ivano-Frankovsk and Makariy of Kolomyia, and the author of this article took part in the symposium.

"Realism in Politics" was the main theme of the discussion. To take a realistic stance with respect to the important problems of war and peace today, one must realize that the matter of whether or not there is to be war is a matter for everyone, regardless of his world outlook or ideology. This would appear to be elementary reasoning requiring no proof. A great deal had to occur in the world over the past 15-20 years, however, to dispel prejudices preventing

¹PRAVDA, 6 January 85.

²For information on previous meetings arranged by the International Peace Institute in Vienna and the Theological School at Vienna University, read articles published in our magazine (Nos. 1 and 7, 1975; No. 8, 1976; Nos. 6 and 9, 1977; No. 7, 1984)--Editor's note

the uniting of efforts by broad sections of the population of the USA, the FRG, Great Britain and other nations of the West with differing views and to remove barriers to cooperation among peace-loving forces of the capitalist nations and the public in the socialist states.

At the end of the 40's and the beginning of the 50's leaders of the largest churches in the West did their bit to stir up the cold war. Their support at that time made it markedly easier for imperialist groups to increase anti-communist passions and the anti-Soviet campaign, and to accelerate the arms race, which included the most destructive and devastating weapons history had ever known. In the "Heidelberg Theses" approved by the Synod of Evangelical Churches of the FRG in 1959, for example, it "recognized participation in the attempt to secure peace in a situation of freedom by means of atomic weapons as a possible Christian act even today" (Thesis 8). The Catholic Church, which incited hostility toward the socialist states, was even more zealous in its support of the arms race at that time.

At the beginning of the 70's the policy of the USA and other nations in the West showed a shift toward a more realistic course, and this had to affect the position of the churches. The upsurge of the antiwar movement, however, was the most important factor motivating a significant portion of the Western clergy to change their attitude toward the problems of preserving peace, making it a practical matter instead of an abstract one. In view of the increased military danger, even clergy with conservative orthodox views became aware of the need for practical action to eliminate it. They understood that if a nuclear catastrophe were not prevented, it would spare no one--neither believers nor atheists.

Many aspects of the more complex international situation and the tasks arising in it for all who value peace and the preservation of our planet were discussed at symposiums conducted within the framework of the "Dialogue on Peace" among Christians and Marxists. The discussions provided the participants with new information and conclusions. The benefit from such meetings is apparent. The fact that there were conflicts of opposing opinions in the discussions made the dialogue even more valuable.

The Theological School of Vienna University and the International Peace Institute were the initiators of the symposium in Hamburg as well as of previous meetings of this kind.

When he opened the meeting, R. Weiler, a canon at the Theological School, directed attention to the critical and important time at which it was taking place: the next few weeks and months will show whether the talks on restraining the arms race are to be successful. The world lives with the hope that this is possible, and it must not be disappointed. These feelings and the expectations of millions are in and of themselves a great moral force influencing international policy, a well-known Austrian theologian stressed. The principle of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems is the keystone in the structure of a lasting peace. It has carved its way into practical policy on a broad front despite the continuing ideological struggle, which, in R. Weiler's opinion, should have nothing in common with

"psychological warfare." The speaker did not explain what he meant, but it was clear to the symposium participants that there is a clearly defined delineation between objective recognition of the existence of the two different world systems and attempts not just to set them against each other, but to declare a "crusade" against one of them, to resolve conflicts between them by military force. Such a course would lead to an unprecedented catastrophe and would be tantamount to suicide for mankind.

R. Weiler mentioned the pastoral message sent out by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in May 1983, calling upon "all men and women of good will" to make the struggle for peace their main goal. It met with broad response in the USA and beyond its borders. In the Austrian theologian's opinion, this document is indicative of the desire of an ever increasing number of people to think not in terms of a "strategy of deterrence," but in terms of good neighborliness and international cooperation.

I was designated to speak at the meeting for the Soviet Committee for Protection of the Peace. In my report I attempted to draw attention to that which is at the center of the efforts of all peace-loving groups, including the clergy and religious organizations. Realism in politics demands a clear awareness of that indisputable fact that there can be no winner not just in a nuclear war, but in the arms race as well. The continued stockpiling of weapons threatens to deplete our planet's far from unlimited resources. And a nuclear conflict would have the most catastrophic consequences. The halting of the arms race, particularly the race in atomic weapons, is an urgent requirement of our era.

Participants in the meeting were acquainted with initiatives and proposals advanced by the USSR for restraining the arms race. Both before and after the presidential elections in the USA, K.U. Chernenko more than once indicated the Soviet Union's readiness to strive for agreement with the United States on the most important problems of disarmament, based on principles of equality and identical security. It is the firm conviction of the USSR that the freezing of existing nuclear arsenals, a commitment not to be the first to employ nuclear weapons, which has already been formally announced by our nation, and the inadmissibility of militarizing space are priority tasks, the accomplishment of which would contribute significantly to the restraining of the arms race and elimination of the threat of war.

Numerous questions were addressed to the speaker, particularly about the Soviet Union's attitude toward the American "Star Wars" program. And although this problem is far removed from theological debate, the interest in it which was demonstrated by prominent theologians of the West demonstrated that they understand how important it is to prevent the militarization of space, if we want to achieve disarmament. Characteristically, none of the participants in the meeting came out in support of this Pentagon plan.

There was also discussion about how the ideological struggle in the contemporary world is affecting international relations and the political climate on the planet.

Soviet participants in the symposium expressed the opinion that the Reagan Administration has not only markedly ideologized its foreign policy, but is attempting to unite other nations in the West round the USA under the flag of a "crusade" against the Soviet Union and other socialist nations, against communism.

It is because of this that the danger of war has increased. All attempts to resolve conflicts between states with different systems by resurrecting the cold war can have fatal consequences for universal peace. This is why it is so important to draw a definite line between ideology and inter-state relations, which must be developed along lines of cooperation to eliminate the danger of a devastating conflict which threatens all nations.

Doctor Margaret Controneo of the University of Pennsylvania in the USA, stated that there can be no mutual trust without contacts between governments. Mutual understanding is impossible without communication. Differences in ideological and other views are not a hindrance but an additional stimulus to an even more intensive search for a practical basis for joint action for the sake of assuring a peaceful future.

These differences were brought out especially clearly during the discussion at the symposium about nuclear arsenals in Europe and about the Vienna talks on limiting troops and weapons in Central Europe.

Theologians in the West are now being forced to deal with these issues, because they are of concern to broad segments of the believers. This is a good sign. The more people are interested in "important policy," the more difficult it will be for the initiators of the arms race to impose their militaristic aims upon others.

Some of the symposium participants, which were under the influence of Western propaganda, attempted to cast doubts upon the sincerity of the peace-loving strivings of the USSR and other socialist nations. It is not surprising that such concepts are still being spread, when we consider the flow of anti-Sovietism which rains down upon the heads of residents in the West and which not every person can see through. No matter how persistently the myth of the "Soviet threat" is promoted, however, it now hobbles along on increasingly decrepit legs, because it is becoming increasingly more difficult to conceal the real state of affairs from the world community. This is why such "Sovietologists" as Richard Pipes (USA), for example, have recently been attempting to place the anti-Soviet fabrications onto a "theoretical" base. It is asserted, among other things, that since the social system in the USSR and other socialist states differs from the Western system, this fact alone, they would have us believe, constitutes a "threat" to the West. Pipes has gone so far as to say that only the elimination of our state ownership of the land can be a "guarantee" of peace for the USA! Such "arguments" are put into play in order to convince gullible people in the West that there is "no freedom of religion" in the Soviet Union and to cast doubt upon its peace-loving policy on this "basis."

The symposium in Hamburg did not succeed in straying from constructive dialogue. Its Soviet participants and the representatives of other socialist states specifically discussed the state of affairs in this area, demonstrating the insolvency and even more, the ill-intention, of attempts to cast a shadow on the foreign policy of the fraternal nations under fabricated, baseless pretexts.

Doctor R. Steigerwalt of the FRG pointed out in his speech the fact that those who support "bans on professions," see nothing wrong in chronic mass unemployment and close their eyes to many other indications that basic human social rights in the capitalist society are being flouted do not have the right to talk about "the advantages of Western democracy."

The American theologians who came to Hamburg acquainted the symposium participants with the draft of a new pastoral message from Catholic bishops of the USA on the problem of the ever worsening poverty there. Naturally, this document does not speak of the class struggle or the irreconcilable conflicts between labor and capital. Nonetheless, the facts cited in it graphically demonstrate the acuteness of social conflicts in the USA and objectively demonstrate the insolvency of conclusions contained in a number of recent Vatican documents, which are directed against the class struggle and condemn demonstrations by the working masses in defense of their social and other rights.

And so, the meeting in Hamburg discussed not only and not so much theoretical problems.

Only a quest for mutually acceptable ways to achieve a lasting peace and a constructive approach to the resolution of complex international problems can assure the security of peoples and their social and other rights, among which the right to life is the most important.

COPYRIGHT: Zhurnal "Nauka i religiya", 1985.

11499

CSO: 1807/343

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

PRESS CONFERENCE ON CSCE ANNIVERSARY PAMPHLET PUBLICATION

PM230707 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by B. Ivanov: "Ten Years On"]

[Text] The All-European Conference Final Act signed in Helsinki 10 years ago was the result of a manifestation of political reason and will for peace on the part of all its participants. It has become a general reference point for achieving great trust among states, preventing international crises, and securing cooperation in the interests of peace.

This was said by participants in a press conference held in Moscow 19 July. It was organized by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and was devoted to the publication of the report "Helsinki 10 Years On. The All-European Process for Building Security and Developing Cooperation: Results and Prospects." The committee's document contains broad, in-depth analysis of European states' activity in the light of the provisions and principles formulated in the Final Act.

Ye.K. Silin, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation; Academician O.T. Bogomolov; R.G. Bogdanov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States of America and Canada; and A.Ya. Sukharev, RSFSR justice minister, and others who addressed the press conference unanimously stressed that the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was an event of tremendous historical significance. It took stock of the results of World War II and outlined the areas for states' long-term activity so as to turn Europe into a continent of peace and mutually beneficial cooperation.

The document points out, in particular, that two processes have taken shape and, as it were, advanced in parallel in European politics, and indeed in world politics as a whole in the last decade. One represents a continuation of the "Helsinki spirit," the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act and the further expansion of all-European political, economic and cultural ties. Progress along this path, which was quite intensive until the beginning of the eighties, then somewhat slowed down, although it is still continuing with the participation of most European states.

A process running counter to this, stimulated by U.S. policy in the late seventies and early eighties, aims to undermine the positive results of the all-European conference. Although a number of America's European NATO partners adhere to this course to some degree, the West does not have a united stance on many very important aspects of all-European policy.

Many Western mass media organs today try to ignore the all-European conference or to prove that, with the whole of seventies' detente, it was just an "episode," a "deviation" from the objective course of world politics. The opinion is expressed in Washington, for example, that the "Helsinki process" has brought Europe no positive results at all. However, these far-fetched homilies are easily refuted.

The years which have elapsed since Helsinki, the report's authors point out, have not only confirmed the importance of the accords reached but have also shown that it is essential to wage a constant struggle to implement them. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have demonstrated in word and deed their fidelity of the Final Act provisions and to the struggle to implement them, develop peaceful cooperation in Europe, and turn the European continent into a peace zone.

As was stressed at the press conference, our country has made a weighty contribution to the cause of developing comprehensive cooperation among states. In the years since the conference the USSR has signed dozens of treaties and agreements with West European countries aimed at extending political, trade, economic, and cultural ties on the continent. This all shows that the Helsinki spirit is alive. It has also been enhanced by the other important landmarks of the "Helsinki process" in the last decade: The Belgrade meeting of representatives of states participating in the all-European conference, the Madrid meeting, and finally, the Stockholm conference on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe, which is currently taking place. These forums demonstrate anew that detente, rather than confrontation, accords with the most pressing vital interests of East and West.

However, the development of events continues to give cause for concern over the continent's fate. The point is, as the press conference pointed out, that Washington has for a long time now refused to adhere to the itinerary laid down at Helsinki. It tries to act as the master rather than the guest in the all-European house, so that even its partners feel highly uncomfortable. And what comfort can there be, indeed when part of the all-European house has already been turned into a nuclear arms dump bristling with Pershing and cruise missiles? The deployment of these missiles could have quite "unforeseeable" consequences for European security, the report's compilers stress.

The U.S. Administration's course aimed at upsetting the present strategic balance, achieving military superiority, and creating and producing new kinds of nuclear weapons poses a very serious threat to world peace. The practical implementation of the White House program for creating space strike weapons, known as the "Star Wars" program, would inevitably give

an irreversible character to the arms race, lead to a sharp destabilization of the global strategic situation, and intensify the threat of nuclear war. Answering a question put at the press conference by your correspondent, R.G. Bogdanov observed that the desire of Washington's strategists to embroil their West European partners in their space adventure was capable of undermining the very roots of European security and of turning the Old World into a nuclear racetrack.

As for the Soviet Union, it has always advocated absolute observance of the Helsinki accords. The CPSU and the Soviet Government proceed from the premise that the intergovernmental documents of the detente period, including the All-European Conference Final Act, have lost none of their significance. These documents are an example of how international relations can be built if one is guided by principles of equality and identical security and the search for mutually acceptable decisions and accords.

Participants in the press conference concluded by stressing that the 10 years which have elapsed since Helsinki show that the struggle for peace in Europe is a complicated and difficult matter. But they also highlight detente's vitality. Time has undoubtedly shown that Helsinki was an important stage in Europe's postwar development and a continuation of trends whose foundations were laid at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. The Final Act's vitality lies in its profound link with the interests of the peoples of Europe, because it meets the requirements for preserving the peace essential to everyone on earth.

CSO: 1807/399

SOCIALIST COMMUNITY AND CEMA AFFAIRS

IMPORTANCE OF WARSAW PACT FOR NON-EUROPEAN SOCIALIST STATES

Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 85 p 4

[Article by O. Stroganov, "Novosti" Press Agency, Warsaw-Moscow: "A Reliable Shield of Peace--14 May Is the 30th Anniversary of the Warsaw Pact"]

[Text] I have been present at the concluding of international agreements more than once in the high-ceilinged, white-columned hall of the ancient palace on (Krakovskoye predmest'ye) street in the Polish capital, where 30 years ago, on 14 May 1955, the European Socialist Nations signed their multi-lateral Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. On 26 April 1985, at that same place, seven of its members--Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia--signed a protocol stating that the Warsaw Pact would remain in force for the next 20 years, with its possible extension for another 10 years after that.

History has not known another such alliance, in which relations are based on total equality and comradely mutual assistance among sovereign states and which threatens no one but is totally devoted to the defense of peace. With respect to relations with nations of the other social system, we base them on the principle of peaceful coexistence, the only intelligent basis, particularly in the nuclear age, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stated in a speech following passage of the protocol extending the pact.

Despite all the official restraint of the general atmosphere surrounding this event, it is now difficult to refrain from emotions and comparisons. All the more, since they are embellished by personal participation in reporting on several meetings of the Political Consultative Committee, the highest joint decision-making body of the Warsaw Pact Organization (OVD), in the press in recent years.

Characteristically, many leaders of Western States "passed through" that white-columned hall, through the nation's capital--the repository of the Warsaw Pact's most important documents--in one way or another as they moved in the direction of detente and cooperation: Pompidou, Giscard D'Estaing, Brandt, Scheel, Schmidt, Nixon, Carter.... I recall how, immediately after the signing of the Polish-West German agreement normalizing relations on 7 December here, Chancellor Willy Brandt set out for the ruins of Pawiak,

the former Hitlerite prison, and how, on that cold day, in the rain and snow, he bowed his bare head and went down on his knees on the cold, unbearably stinging granite of the monument to Warsaw's heroes. At the end of December 1977, in that same hall, U.S. President Jimmy Carter also signed documents affirming loyalty to peaceful coexistence and to the search for ways to strengthen peace.... The fact that not all of those officials, and especially their successors, were sincere is another matter. They would soon thrust their states and their NATO allies into a new confrontation with the socialist nations and exacerbate it to a degree of danger such as had perhaps never existed during the entire 36 years of the North Atlantic bloc's existence and the Warsaw Pact's 30 years.

As a representative of the Soviet press, I had the opportunity to write about large exercises by the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact, which are held from time to time on the territories of the allied states, and at the same time to see and hear the reaction of Western military observers invited to attend those exercises in accordance with recommendations of the Helsinki Final Act. What they saw convinced them that the defense capability of each individual socialist nation and its international influence have been increased to the level of the common defense strength and joint political prestige of all the states belonging to their alliance.

A great deal is said and written about the contrast between the principles, objectives and missions of the two pacts--NATO and the OVD. Just how do these differences appear with the time factor figured in? Periods of 36 and 30 years--what now? After all, when they recently signed the protocol extending the Warsaw Pact, its participants were forced to do so and have absolutely no desire to perpetuate the schism and military confrontation in Europe and in the world for several more decades. We have more than once expressed our readiness to dissolve the Warsaw Pact, if NATO will agree to do the same, M.S. Gorbachev has stated. This basic position still stands in its entirety.

We know that it was just the 4th year after the end of World War II when the aggressive North Atlantic Pact was concluded--at that very time when the socialist nations, healing the wounds inflicted by the Hitlerite occupation and the war, demonstrated common concern for accelerating their economic development and established the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance. The latter is open to all who want to collaborate with or within it. We also know that only 6 years later they were forced to take a determined responsive step and set up a defensive alliance--the Warsaw Pact Organization--to protect themselves and the peace. This was at a time when the arms race in the NATO nations had reached its highest pitch for that time and when the remilitarized FRG was taken into that bloc.

In order to hold back the march of time, NATO's founders proclaimed their bloc to be of practically unlimited duration. Articles 12 and 13 of the North Atlantic Pact, to be sure, provides for mutual consultations among the member states at the end of 10 years for the possible revision of certain of its provisions, and give the individual nations the right to withdraw from it after 20 years, but do not contain provisions for terminating the pact itself.

It was with absolutely different, realistic consideration of the time factor and with confidence about the inevitability of international detente that the Warsaw Pact was signed. It foresaw a future peaceful Europe, united by an effective system of collective security and with the participation of all concerned nations on the continent, as well as the USA, Canada and other nations, should they desire this. The Warsaw Pact participants, however, were forced to consider the fact that the path to that optimistic objective would not be an easy one and would not be covered rapidly. Article XI of the Pact openly states that it was concluded for a period of 20 years and that it would remain in effect for another 10 years for those parties who have not announced that they are withdrawing from the Pact a year before the 20 years elapse.

Now, at the end of 20 years plus 10, members of the Warsaw Pact have agreed on the objective necessity to extend its term of effectiveness, stipulating also an adjustment in time, which could be put into effect by the harsh reality of the 21st century.

But will the reader find anything in the text of the North Atlantic Pact like that stated in the final article of the Warsaw Pact? Specifically: in case a system of collective security is established in Europe and a general European treaty is concluded for this purpose--and the Warsaw Pact nations will be persistently striving for this--this Pact will lose its force the day the general European treaty takes effect.

An effective extension of these strivings have been the collective initiatives of the socialist nations in conducting such extensive interstate forums as the General European Conference on Security and Cooperation held in Helsinki in 1975, the subsequent Belgrade and Madrid meetings of 33 European states, the USA and Canada, which signed the Helsinki Final Act, their current Stockholm Conference on measures of trust, security and disarmament, and the Vienna Talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe....

Interstate coalitions have existed in the world, do exist and will continue to exist. Every nation is free to choose allies and friends to its own taste so long as the allied relations are based on equal rights and do not aim arrows of aggression against other states. Unlike NATO and the closed economic grouping of Western states like the EEC, all of the political and organizational controls of the socialist commonwealth are constantly switched to detente and extensive international cooperation.

It would probably be difficult for conservative Western politicians to agree that the North Atlantic Pact, aside from building up tensions in the world, has achieved practically none of the main purposes for which it was established. Recalling the frightening terminology of doctrines existing from the time of Truman to Reagan--"restraining and thrusting back" communism or the "liberation" from communism of socialist nations and the individual Union Soviet republics making up the USSR, "balancing on the brink," the "pre-emptive strike" and "preventive reaction," it should be pointed out that communism has not been thrust back and not been halted, and that the peoples of a number of nations--Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Angola and Nicaragua,

as an example--after the NATO bloc was created and despite it, gained their liberation precisely from capitalism and colonialism and are building their new societies within the family of other liberated peoples and states.

Like all of the non-European socialist nations, Cuba and Vietnam are not members of the Warsaw Pact Organization. For them, however, and even for certain states with a different social system, this Pact has totally justified hopes for the preservation of peace linked to it and will continue to do so. With its precisely defined class nature and specific regional geographic framework, the Warsaw Pact provides a solid foundation for the collective security of the entire socialist commonwealth and serves as an example of possibilities for general European security.

We know what steps have been taken by "cold war" strategists to prevent the development of socialism in nations which proclaimed themselves 40 years ago, following World War II, to be states of popular democracy. Numerous attempts have been made and are continuing to be made to deprive the European socialist nations even of their historical right to be an integral part of Europe. This has only resulted in the prolonged separation of Western Europe itself from most of the continent and turned it into a bridgehead of "Atlantism," and now into a nuclear hostage of the USA under the guise of NATO's so-called dual decision on additional armament and the Reagan "Strategic Defense Initiative" for the militarization of space.

It was noted at the April Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee that imperialism is attempting to take social revenge on an extremely broad front: both with respect to the socialist commonwealth and against nations which have been liberated from colonial oppression, against the national liberation movements and against the workers of the capitalist states. This is forcing us at the present time to think about further strengthening the Warsaw Pact Organization. In the words of General Wojciech Jaruzelski, the Polish leader, at a reception following the signing of the protocol extending the Pact, one does not lay down his shield when the other party is taking up its sword.

11499

CSO: 1807/329

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

WEST'S ATTEMPT TO USE ISLAM FOR ANTI-SOVIET PURPOSES SCORED

Tashkent OQITUVCHILAR GAZETASI in Uzbek 1 May 85 p 4

[Article by Sh. Hikmatov, scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Oriental Institute: "On the Fronts of Ideological Struggle: 'The Islamic Factor' and Anticommunism"]

[Text] One of the most important and clearest signs of the present age is the contradiction between socialism and capitalism. In the second half of this century, especially in recent years, the ideological struggle has occupied a major place. On the whole, it is natural that there should be an ideological struggle in a world divided between two contradictory systems. In the materials of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee June 1982 [as published] Plenum, there is a profound and scientifically based evaluation of today's ideological struggle.

Imperialism has never before spent so much energy and money on ideological struggle, nor has it whipped up on such a broad scale the psychological war against the USSR and other countries of the socialist commonwealth.

"The class enemy," it was stated at the CPSU Central Committee June 1983 Plenum, "is openly expressing its intention to get rid of the socialist structure. Imperialism considers 'psychological warfare' one of its chief means to achieve its goal. The West is conducting this war against the Soviets and against communism on a note of shrill hysteria."

The facts show that beginning in the early 1980's, the U.S. imperialists, attempting to give an ideological form to their programs of expansionism and world domination, started to try to use religious phraseology and religion for propaganda goals. Such a religious mask serves to hide the true intentions of imperialist forces, to justify their aggressive attacks in the eyes of the world community, and to abuse the faith of religious persons. They call our country a "center of evil" and an "evil empire," and allege that the land of soviets is devoid of any moral and ethical principles because atheists live in it.

It is nothing new to use religion as an excuse in the ideological struggle on the world scene. However, religious ideology had never been used by the reactionary side in the struggle against socialism in the way it has been used in recent years.

Imperialism and all the international reactionary forces have been making increasing use of the Islamic question in recent years in the whipped up propaganda campaign against communism. This is related to the characteristics of the development of the Islamic religion. This is because the national liberation movement is growing in many countries of Asia and Africa, and the working masses' struggle to defend their class interests is becoming stronger. Patriotic forces are uniting under national slogans, and the role of the Near and Middle East is growing in today's politics.

Oil-rich Arab countries and Iran comprise the center of the "Islamic world." Many countries in various degrees are tied to them, especially financially. Pakistan and Egypt can also be added to this center. Al-Azhar Muslim University, one of the centers of Islamic ideology, operates on Egyptian territory. In many countries Islam is recognized as the official state religion and is affirmed in the constitution. In a number of Muslim states the social, political, and legal institutions are linked to the Islamic faith, and it directs many aspects of social life. Eight hundred million people live in these countries and they are very strategically located.

Since ancient times Islam has been the means of mass political mobilization in the East. For centuries, religious ideology was dominant. Therefore, the national liberation movement against colonialism began under religious slogans. The popular masses who lived in feudal conditions raised their heads first of all against oppressors of an alien religion and against those who trampled their "national faith."

Beginning in the 1970's and 1980's, the Islamic religion's role as a factor grew and it began to have a great effect on the masses' social activity. Its influence in particular grew on international relations in the Near and Middle East and Africa. This is arousing all kinds of defenders of anti-communism, in particular the ruling circles of reactionary Muslim states, and the desire to utilize religion in the ideological and political struggle against the Soviet Union and the revolutionary-democratic forces.

Western bourgeois ideologists and the Muslim reactionaries, their press organs, and propagandistic literature are writing a lot about an "Islamic renaissance," and the "growth of Islam's role in history." At the same time, the anti-Soviets in their propaganda campaign conducted with the goal of arousing enmity toward the Soviet Union among the population of the Muslim countries, are spreading slander about communists' "merciless attitude [murossasizligil]" toward religion, i.e., including Islam. Slandorous statements have been invented about "persecution" of Muslims in the USSR, destruction of monuments of Islamic culture, and even about the "slaughter" of religious believers in the Soviet state. The United States and its allies, by spreading inventions about the Muslim region coming under a "Soviet threat" in order to mask their own imperialist aspirations, are attempting to arouse public opinion in the Near and Middle East. Supposedly the Soviet Union is intending to conquer their territory in order to open the way to warm seas.

The things written in this campaign against the Soviets are typical of the bourgeois propaganda which shies at nothing as it attempts to achieve its goals. Such dissemination of slander and false news has grown in connection with revolutionary changes which have taken place in Iran and Afghanistan.

The campaign whipped up around Afghanistan is a clear example of the use of religion for reactionary political goals; it is being set into motion to confuse the religious masses and to poison their minds against the proponents of social progress. The more the national-democratic revolution has strengthened since April 1978, the more the new has won out over the old, and the bolder the steps of the republic--the stronger the opposition of imperialism and reactionary forces has been.

This is because they do not at all like the path of progress chosen by the Afghan people. Consequently they have been conducting an undeclared war against the Afghanistan Democratic Republic for several years. The inspirers and organizers of this war are the imperialist circles.

The local and foreign reaction is conducting work by relying in many ways on religious forces. The (?cries) [ayuhanoslar] of these forces about the "godless regime" in Afghanistan attempting to eliminate Islam are designed to confuse the masses of the people. In this way, under the green banner of Islam, they are attempting to distract attention from the threat of the counterrevolutionary forces who are trying to restore the social-economic privileges from which they profited. It is worth noting that all the Afghan counterrevolutionaries have taken the mask of Islam: among them are the "Afghanistan Islamic Party" and the "Islamic Revolutionary Movement."

Political peddling based on anticommunist propaganda's use of the Islamic problem is being done to all countries of the Muslim region. Here the propagandists of anti-Sovietism and rightist Muslim figures tie their provocations in one way or another with the life of Muslims of the Soviet Union. Their main intended goal is to detract from the theory and practice of communism, and to show the state of Islam under conditions of socialism in distorted fashion.

Therefore, the revolutionary forces do not shy from the vilest provocations. A brochure disseminated in a number of Muslim countries several years ago is an example of this. This book, which was a provocation, was titled "The Soviet Union and Islam." It was supposedly issued by NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY. In it the Muslim religious situation in the USSR and the Soviet Government's nationality policy were portrayed in greatly distorted fashion, and there were statements insulting the honor of certain Muslim countries. This was considered to insult the religious feelings of Islamic religious believers and was intended to arouse hatred for communism and the Soviet Union. The baselessness of these dirty inventions were unmasked at a news conference of NOVOSTI NEWS AGENCY.

Falsification still has quite a role in today's anticommunist propaganda. At the same time it should be noted in particular that in the last 10-15 years the center of gravity of propaganda work against communism has shifted

to the question of Islam and nationalism. Our ideological opponents, evaluating the changes of Islam and nationalism in their own way, have begun to search hard for opportunities to use them against communism and the Soviet state.

Our ideological enemies are using events in Iran and Afghanistan to cast slurs on the Soviet Union and to try to produce cracks in the CPSU's Leninist foreign and domestic policies, and in the historical victories of socialist society. At the same time they do not abandon the hope of strengthening feelings of religious nationalism among a certain part of the Soviet population. In this regard, anticommunist propaganda in recent years has begun to resort with increasing frequency to the Islamic doctrines of the national question. [sentence as published]

CSO: 1836/435

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

BRIEFS

FOREIGN STUDENTS AT TASHKENT INSTITUTE--Tashkent YOSH LENINCHI in Uzbek 26 April 1985 carries on page 4 a 500-word article titled "I'm Intrigued by You." The article consists primarily of comments by an Angolan student enrolled in Tashkent Agricultural Institute. The introduction to the student's comments reports that there are 441 students from Asia, Africa, and Latin America at the institute. [Editorial Report]

CSO: 1836/435

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

PRAVDA STRESSES MILITARY ASPECTS OF U.S. SPACE PROGRAMS

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 85 p 6

[Article by V. Sukhoy: "Cosmic Mirages"]

[Text] In the slate-black abyss of space, tens of thousands of kilometers above the earth, rise the "walls" of an impregnable "cosmic fortress." From the bastions of this "fortress," around which "cosmic interceptors," "orbital killer satellites," "missiles that kill missiles," and "military space stations" will revolve, America will be able to look at the world imperiously....

This is not a passage from the script of a fantastic Hollywood series on "star wars." That is how the authors of the brochure issued by the American aerospace firm Rockwell International imagine the future of space. Its title, "Space: America's Frontiers for Growth, Leadership and Freedom," is notable.

The title is perhaps not only notable but in many respects instructive as well. More and more frequently, the United States declares space to be still another area of its "vitally important interests." As Prof V. Mosko of Temple University in Philadelphia wrote in the pages of the French journal MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE, the United States wants to trace "new frontiers and new boundaries of the American empire" in space.

At one of his recent press conferences, the head of the White House asserted that his announced "initiative in the area of strategic defense," which foresees the deployment of weapons in space, has nothing to do with "star wars." Accordingly, the only purpose of this initiative is to "protect the territory of the United States" against the ballistic missiles of the "enemy," to make nuclear armaments "useless and obsolete," and supposedly to open the way to success in the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. Other leading people of the current administration also express themselves in the same spirit.

And what about the military-industrial complex of the United States? "We should not allow ourselves to be deceived" is how an official representative of the Pentagon expressed his frame of mind. But the views of the adherents of "star wars" attained a consummate form in the new edition of the military manual of the U.S. Air Force. "Initially," states this document with surprising candor, "we must lay the foundation for military actions in space and make it understood that we cannot put off or not undertake such actions."

The idea of the "urgency" of scientific-research and experimental-design work to create space armaments was proclaimed earlier as well. The "Directives in the Area of Defense for 1984-1988," an official Pentagon document, states, for example, that the United States "must be guaranteed that treaties and agreements do not block the possibility for the development of military space potentials.

It is perfectly clear that the \$26 billion that the current American administration intends to spend in the next 5 years in preparing for "Star Wars" are by no means being spent out of "infinite love for science." The talk to the effect that things are still limited to scientific research that supposedly promises technological benefits is called upon to camouflage the true aims. After all, the Manhattan Project began from purely scientific research that later resulted in the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Three nuclear-research laboratories--Livermore (California) and Los Alamos and Sandia (New Mexico)--serve as the scientific basis for the creation of space weapons. "Scientists at these laboratories represent a great force in the matter of forcing and continuing the arms race," wrote Hugh DeWitt, a physicist and theoretician from Livermore Laboratory, recently in the pages of the scientific journal BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS.

The facts bear him out. The "Star Wars" idea arose at Livermore. At Los Alamos and Sandia laboratories, complex scientific-research work was carried out for the first time for the creation of a beam weapon. Events later developed with kaleidoscopic speed--a "chain reaction," as it were. The scientific ideas left the confines of the laboratories and found various sorts of "enthusiasts," whereby, as noted by G. Dash, physics professor from Washington University, they came mainly from among the ardent anticommunists and open supporters of the interests of the military-industrial complex. As a result, the once-bold scientific ideas turned into projects dangerous to the cause of peace.

Arthur, King of the Britons and hero of the popular Celtic legends, who fought against the Anglo-Saxon conquerors, had two swords. Each of them, according to tradition, possessed miraculous and supernatural power and was called Excalibur.

The legendary King Arthur and his glorious knights personify the ideals of valor and nobility. The modern-day "knights" from Livermore Laboratory hardly possess the above-named virtues. Nevertheless, they gave the program for testing the X-ray laser precisely this name--"Excalibur." By 1987, it is planned to increase appropriations for these "purely scientific experiments" to \$37 million.

The advocates of the militarization of space have just taken up a new propaganda theme. They assert that the scientific-research work in the framework of the "Star Wars" program is a "lottery that one cannot lose," since, as they say, the discoveries of the scientists will in any case find applications in the peace economy and the latest technology promises considerable commercial benefits. These are truly fantastic arguments. The English newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES reported that a bundle of particles obtained in the giant accelerator of Stanford University somehow "accidentally went off course" and in an instant

destroyed metal structures weighing many tons. There is nothing surprising about that. At Stanford, they are experimenting with a beam weapon of great destructive power. How can the American civilian economy benefit from this work directed toward the creation of a weapon of death? Or let us take the X-ray laser being developed at Livermore Laboratory. To obtain the X-rays, one needs the energy released in the explosion of a 1-megaton hydrogen bomb. Perhaps precisely this "technology" is "promising" for merchants? It is difficult or, more accurately, impossible to prove the unprovable....

The military business of the United States wildly applauds the "Star Wars" idea. It has been calculated that a large-scale system of antiballistic defense with elements based in space, whose establishment would undermine the termless Soviet-American agreement on limiting antiballistic defense systems, will cost \$500 billion. Where specifically are these tremendous capital expenditures going?

In mid-December of last year, the Pentagon announced the distribution of the first 10 military space contracts among 7 California companies--Hughes Aircraft, Thompson-Ramo-Woolridge (TRW), Rockwell International, General Research, Lockheed, McDonnell-Douglas and Science Applications--2 Alabama firms--Sparta and Teledyne Brown Engineering--and also the Martin Marietta concern in Colorado. For them, as well as for the companies Boeing, Ford Aerospace, and Helionetics, the "Star Wars" program is a "new Eldorado," a "cosmic Klondike."

"When people ask what resources must be allocated to military expenditures," argues one of the managers of Rockwell International, "they compare them with expenditures for social needs, education, and the like. I cannot understand that at all.... We can attain a decisive advantage only if we gather all of our strengths." Rockwell International is truly "gathering all of its strengths": it annually receives contracts from the Pentagon and NASA amounting to \$3 to 3.5 billion.

It does not seem so long ago that the civilian space program was an object of national pride in America. It is now becoming secondary in importance under the pressure of the rapidly increasing efforts to use space for the purpose of achieving military superiority.

To launch its "Space Shuttles," the U.S. military authorities are forcing the rapid construction of a spaceport at Vandenberg Air Force Base (California). The first Shuttle launching from the new spaceport is planned for January 1986. Altogether, of the 234 Shuttle flights planned through 1994, 114--almost 49 percent--will be for the benefit of the Defense Department.

To the east of Colorado Springs, on a 640-acre site wrested from the prairie the Pentagon is constructing a "Joint Center for Space Operations" at a cost of a minimum of \$1.2 billion. Nowhere is the space arms race felt to the extent that it is here, in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. As the president of the Colorado Chamber of Commerce put it, the once-quiet area popular with tourists is literally being transformed before one's eyes into the "military space Mecca of the free world."

Not far from the future "Joint Center for Space Operations" is the "Center for Aerospace Defense," which is under the control of the joint space command of the U.S. Armed Forces established in December of last year. This center, wrote the French weekly VSD, occupies "2,000 hectares of neon-illuminated tunnels cut out of Cheyenne Mountain at a depth of 500 meters." About 100 computers are located there. From here, they will observe the military flights of the shuttle spaceships, an extremely delicate matter that is too secret to be handled at the space center in Houston (Texas).

Near Los Angeles, wrote the American journal ESQUIRE, there are at least two spaceports of the future. And whereas the Hotel Bonaventura, seemingly composed of huge tubes in which high-speed elevators lift the residents somewhere high in the sky, can be called a spaceport only figuratively, the renowned jet-propulsion laboratory in Pasadena is a spaceport of the future in the most direct sense of the word. For more than 7 years now, the automatic stations Voyager 1 and Voyager 2 have been boring into the emptiness of the universe. In the near future, Voyager 2 will fly past Uranus in its rush to Neptune. And the laboratory is already preparing for the flight of the new automatic station Galileo. The scientific and ideological importance of these flights is great.

In the vacuum of space and, possibly, only there is it feasible to obtain rare metallic alloys and crystals for electronic equipment, ideally round microscopic spheres for calibrating medical instruments, and ultra-pure pharmaceutical products, in particular vaccines. According to an analysis carried out by NASA, the technical documentation has already been prepared for carrying out 244 industrial experiments in orbit. This is where the firms from Silicon Valley (California), Austin (Texas), and Tampa (Florida) could apply their achievements. To teach the most up-to-date microprocessors and computers "peaceful space occupations" is not only a noble task but also a highly urgent one. For one must not convert space into one's "sphere of vital interests" through its militarization. In that way, one can only make it a source of universal misfortunes and deadly dangers.

"And it is useless to try to look into the distant future. In the final analysis, nothing in the future can be foretold with certainty...." With this pessimistic passage, K. Peebles, the American specialist on the history of the conquest of space, ended his monograph. And, as if in disagreement with him, the NEW YORK TIMES wrote in an editorial ridiculing the "mirages of space defense": "Gazing as far as possible into the future, you come to the conclusion that the most effective defense is to come to an agreement with the Soviet Union...."

That is the proper conclusion. Our planet is one. All of the states on it are like people in one boat. And whatever the differences between countries, it is necessary to agree to preserve our own lives and those of our descendants.

9746
CSO: 5200/1230

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

POLITICAL SCIENTIST HITS U.S. INTEREST IN ISLAMIC PROBLEMS

Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 4 Jun 85 p 3

[Article by S. Radzhabov, academician of TaSSR AN [Academy of Sciences], vice president of Soviet Association of Political Sciences: "Under the Screen of Lies: At Fronts of Ideological Struggle"]

[Text] The exposure of falsifications of hysterical bourgeois women, including "sovietologists-islamists," is becoming more and more urgent in connection with aggravation of ideological struggle in the world arena and with a strengthening of anticommunist and antisoviet propaganda on the part of imperialist circles of the United States and Western Europe. What provocations and fabrications don't the lackeys of imperialism undertake to destabilize the international situation and sow mistrust and enmity among peoples! Everything is adopted, but speculation on religion is used especially often.

The scope of "Islamic studies" in U.S. scientific centers has increased. At the present time various aspects of Islamic studies are being developed in practically all institutions and centers of near eastern studies at the majority of U.S. universities. The Middle East Institute in Washington plays a prominent role in the activation and coordination of these studies.

In exploiting the religious feelings of Muslims, American ideologs attempt to take advantage of them in their own interests. The problem of Islam acquires a special role in this respect.

The growth of Islam's influence in the world as well as the social and political changes in Iran, Afghanistan and the Near East have attracted the fixed attention of American orientalist politologists. In connection with the fact that these countries are in the immediate vicinity of the USSR's southern frontiers, these people saw in the events a direct connection with the range of their situational interests.

In analyzing the social and political changes in countries of the East in light of Islam, the "sovietologists" attempt to "substantiate" the inevitability of the Islamic movement's influence in this region on the frame of mind of the

"Muslims of Central Asia," hoping that the influence of religion in the final account will be a kind of "detonator" which will undermine the foundations of the Soviet political system on the soil of "Muslim solidarity." A. Bennigsen, G. Lenczowski, M. Feshbach and others arrive at such conclusions in particular. "Sovietologists" in capitalist countries are developing propagandist cliches about "the USSR--natural enemy of Islam--and the United States--true defender of Muslims," they arrange discussions on the subject "The Soviet Union and the Middle East," and so on.

Such a heightened interest in peoples of the Soviet East for ideologs of imperialism and the Muslim reaction is not accidental. At a time when the United States has set a course toward aggravating international tension and preparing a nuclear war, imperialism's ideologs and their apprentices already consider it superfluous to don the mask of "defenders" of the interests of Soviet Muslims in showing "concern" for their rights and freedoms.

Back in 1979 Z. Brzezinski, former assistant to the president for national security affairs, gave the CIA and FBI an assignment to prepare a capital study entitled "Status of a Number of Muslim Countries in Specific Religious Movements." U.S. diplomatic missions abroad received similar assignments.

Certain "sovietologists" in China also are showing increased interest in problems of Islam's stepped-up international activity. In flirting with Pakistan, the Chinese leaders together with the Muslim reaction are taking part in organizing counterrevolutionary acts against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

The Muslim reaction is closing with imperialism and adopting imperialism's methods in its shameless anticommunism. Some political figures as well as the mass media of a number of eastern countries are following on the heels of imperialist propaganda and attempting to debate the issue of the "rights of Muslims" in the USSR, about the "suppression" of national customs and traditions, and "about Russification." The goal pursued here is to inflame religious and nationalist sentiments among believers in our country.

Relying on Islam, reactionaries of every stripe are attempting at least to hold up the development of revolutionary processes if not to stop them and to attain a loss. Imperialist orientation by those Muslim countries which have taken the path of profound social transformations. Nevertheless, dissatisfaction over U.S. policy in countries of the Near and Middle East is gathering steam even among the leaders of reactionary Muslim regimes.

The threat of imperialist aggression, the U.S. desire to establish military and economic domination over Muslim countries and their natural resources, and the unregulated nature of the eastern problem are prompting Muslim countries with differing political orientation to act together to repulse these attempts and to come out in support of the peaceloving forces. Even some conservative Muslim circles have been forced to admit that in alliance with the USSR and other socialist countries it is possible to carry out a campaign for peace and disarmament, and struggle against the aggressive policy of imperialism and Zionism and against various trends of neocolonialism in the East.

The position of the Soviet state and Communist Party in this connection was formulated extremely clearly in the Central Committee Accountability Report to the 26th CPSU Congress: "Islamic slogans are being actively advanced of late in some countries of the East. We communists have respect for the religious convictions of people who profess Islam as well as other religions. The important factor is what objectives are being pursued by the forces proclaiming particular slogans. A liberation struggle may develop under the banner of Islam, as indicated by the historical experience, including very recent experience. But that experience indicates that the reaction which raises counterrevolutionary revolts also operates with Islamic slogans. Consequently it is all a matter of what is the real content of a particular movement."

Anticommunism and antisovietism continue to be the principal directions of propaganda of the Muslim reaction at the present stage. Depicting the USSR as an "enemy of Islam," reactionary Muslim circles in developing countries of the East in an alliance with rightist forces of the West attempt to distort and blacken the policy of the CPSU and Soviet state, discredit socialism's ideas, weaken their attractive force, and undermine the revolutionary movement in the Asiatic-African region. The Islamic reaction is carrying on subversive politics against states of a socialist orientation and is attempting to disavow those Muslim figures and theologians who hold a principled and consistent anti-imperialist position and who speak out for progressive socio-economic and political transformations in their countries.

A broad arsenal of means is used for this purpose: radio, television, video propaganda, movies, the press and literature. Such international religious centers as the Muslim World League, the Muslim World Congress, Organization of the Islamic Conference, Islamic Council of Europe and so on, also are being used as an anticommunist and antisoviet rostrum.

Three principal directions should be singled out in anticommunist and anti-soviet propaganda: "theoretical" criticism of the principles of Marxism-Leninism from an Islamic position; falsification of the status of Muslims in the USSR; and falsification of the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU and Soviet state with respect to believers, particularly Muslims.

Rightist Muslim circles are instilling in millions of Muslims the concept of the "incompatibility" of communist ideology and atheism with Islam and they are spreading misinformation about the legal status of Muslims in the Soviet Union. At the same time they are preparing and carrying out ideological subversion intended for galvanizing religious and nationalist sentiments among the USSR population, and particularly among residents of the territory of Central Asia, Kazakhstan, Povolzhye and the Transcaucasus historically linked with Islam. They are attempting to distort and blacken the USSR's position concerning peaceful coexistence of states with different sociopolitical systems, problems of general disarmament, and settlement of the near-east crisis.

Reactionary ideologs and political leaders in the East are attempting to justify pan-Islamic ambitions and the right to intervene in the internal affairs of other states, particularly the USSR and other countries of the socialist

community, under the pretext of "defending Muslims against oppression on the part of atheists" by the thesis of the so-called "unity of the Islamic world." Propaganda campaigns are being conducted for this purpose during which the "atheistic" character of the Soviet state and the "persecution" of Soviet citizens professing Islam are considered.

The mass media attempt to debate questions of "Muslim rights in the USSR." "Sovietologists" falsify such issues as the voluntary unification of peoples of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus to Russia and the importance of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the establishment of Soviet power in areas of the traditional spread of Islam in the USSR.

Materials of rightist Muslim mass media distort the Leninist policy of nationalities, the truth about freedom of religion in the USSR and about the country's economic status, the goals of Soviet foreign policy in Asia and Africa, and the reasons for the presence of a limited contingent of Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan. In fact not one of the antisoviet campaigns waged in the West bypasses the pages of the rightist Muslim newspapers and journals in the East.

It was V. I. Lenin who revealed the reactionary essence of pan-Islamism and its class roots. Lenin wrote that pan-Islamism is attempting "to connect the liberation movement against European and American imperialism with a strengthening of the position of the khans, landowners, mullahs and so on."

Pan-Islamists at one time wished to tear Central Asia away from Russia. Religious fanaticism and hatred for peoples of another faith were kindled among representatives of Islam for this purpose. In directing the cutting edge of the campaign against followers of other religions, the advocates of pan-Islam thus attempted to distract the working masses from urgent tasks of class struggle and presented the matter in such a way that relations among people must be based only on a religious foundation and only among those professing Islam, but not with the "unfaithful."

V. I. Lenin wrote in November 1917 that "the establishment of correct relations with peoples of Turkestan now has an importance for the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic which without exaggeration can be said to be gigantic and world-historic.

"I entreat you to give strict attention to this matter and to bend all efforts to establish comradely attitudes toward peoples of Turkestan by example and by action--prove to them by our actions the sincerity of our desire to eradicate all traces of Great Russian imperialism..."

Fundamental Leninist directions on this issue were reflected in the "Declaration of the Rights of Peoples of Russia," adopted on 2 (15) November 1917, and in other documents of the young Soviet power.

The Appeal of the Council of People's Commissars "To All Working Muslims of Russia and the East" of 3 December 1917 was of great importance for peoples of the Soviet East. It stated that Muslim national and cultural establishments

were declared free and inviolable. The following words of the Appeal served as a call for national and state development of socialist Russia: "Arrange your national life freely and unhindered. You have the right to this. Know that your rights, like the rights of all peoples of Russia, are protected by all the might of the revolution and its organs--the soviets of workers', soldiers' and peasants deputies."

The Basic Law--the USSR Constitution--as well as the constitutions of union republics proclaim the equal rights of citizens regardless of religious attitude. Soviet citizens are guaranteed freedom of religion, the right to profess any religion or to profess none, to exercise religious cults or to conduct atheistic propaganda. The church in the USSR is separated from the state and the school is separated from the church.

Representatives of the foreign Muslim clergy who come to Tajikistan see for themselves that Islam as a religion is not persecuted in our country and is a personal matter for the believer. After becoming familiar with reality they themselves expose the lie and slander of bourgeois propaganda about infringement of religious feelings of Muslims in the Soviet Union.

"An incorrect impression exists in my country about the life of Muslims of the Soviet East," declared Sheikh Farid Muhammad Zohir from Sri Lanka, who visited Tajikistan. "I saw that believers here have all civil rights and freedoms granted by the Soviet Constitution."

"Our foreign brothers in the faith arriving in Tajikistan," said Kazi Khodzhi Mirzo Abdullo Kalonzoda in a conversation with an APN correspondent, "often ask me the question: How was it that a Muslim area which was backward in the recent past achieved such enormous success in its economic and cultural development, and what is the secret of your ascent? I answer them that all this became possible because of the Soviet Constitution, which guarantees all nations and nationalities free development along the path of progress."

Religious organizations in the Soviet Union take an active part in the campaign for peace, prevention of the threat of nuclear war, cessation of the arms race, and establishment of good-neighbor relations among peoples. For example, in just a year's time religious organizations of Tajikistan transferred 76,000 rubles into the Peace Fund.

The USSR's policy in the international arena is a logical continuation of the domestic Leninist policy in the question of nationalities. With respect to U.S. policy, this is a policy for setting some peoples on others, a policy of support for Israeli aggression against countries of the Arab East, support to the black reaction in countries of Latin America, and warmongering in the southern part of Africa. Grandiloquently discussing the rights and status of Muslims in the USSR, the sponsors of murders and robbery sent arms to countries with a Muslim populace in an attempt to kindle a fratricidal war there.

No matter how the half-baked pseudophilosophers and politicians camouflage U.S. imperialist plans for countries of the Muslim world, such plans are incapable of leading anyone astray.

WESTERN EUROPE

U.S. SAID TO IMPOSE ARMS BURDEN ON WEST EUROPE

PM191427 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jul 85 Second Edition p 3

[Article "from foreign press materials" by Doctor of Military Sciences Colonel A. Drozhzhin, retired, under the rubric "According to Washington's Militarist Principles": "The Burden of the Arms Race"]

[Text] Washington's desire to give the NATO allied armed forces in Europe the capability to wage active, offensive combat operations against the armies of the Warsaw Pact states without involving American strategic forces is well known. The intention is to safeguard U.S. territory against a crushing retaliatory strike. To this end Washington sought the siting in Western Europe of nuclear facilities for a first, surprise strike--Pershing II ballistic missiles and medium-range cruise missiles. For the same purpose it is dragging the European allies into the arms race which it is whipping up, and demanding that they further increase their nonnuclear potential. And this at a time when their contribution to the NATO war machine, even according to official figures, amounts to 90 percent of the servicemen, 85 percent of the tanks, 80 percent of the aircraft, and 70 percent of the warships.

In order to implement its sinister goals the Reagan administration is exerting unprecedented pressure on its partners. Attempts have been launched to blackmail the allies with the threat of depriving them of American "nuclear guarantees," withdrawing American troops from Europe, reorienting U.S. military efforts toward the Asian and Pacific region, and so forth. The myth of the "threat from the East" is exaggerated in every way, to which end the facts about the NATO and Warsaw Pact military potentials are juggled. But the truth is that in Europe 94 NATO divisions (counting France and Spain) oppose 78 divisions from the Warsaw Pact countries. The NATO countries' forces (including Spain) have more than 17,000 tanks (not counting the 3,000 American tanks and 5,000 tanks belonging to the bloc's European countries which are in stockpiles in Europe). Consequently in terms of the total number of tanks (25,000) the NATO countries do not lag behind the Warsaw Pact countries. NATO has the superiority in fighter-bombers, for which the Warsaw Pact compensates by a slightly larger number of air defense fighter-interceptors. In all, there is an approximate balance of forces in terms of conventional arms.

Nonetheless the escalation of the arms race, leading to the stepping up of the West European countries' military and political dependence on the United States, continues. First and foremost through the imposition of American combat hardware. Here are just a few instances. The scandalous bribery of statesmen in the FRG, Italy, and other countries by the "death corporations" across the ocean with the aim of selling their air forces American F-104 planes which have the nickname "flying coffins" in Western Europe because of their frequent accidents, is well known. American F-4 planes, helicopters, surface-to-air guided missiles (Hawk, Improved Hawk, Nike Hercules), air-to-air missiles (Sidewinder), automated guidance systems, and other military hardware have also been imposed on the West European countries.

Four British nuclear submarines are armed with American Polaris A-3 missiles. The Conservative government intends to replace them with the improved Trident II missiles, also American. This replacement will cost 10 billion pounds sterling.

Joint production with the United States by a number of European countries has been organized for American F-16 and F-18 planes, the Stinger anti-aircraft missile complex (a total number of some 10,000 units by 1989), and multiple rocket launchers. Last year a consortium was created consisting of firms in the United States, the FRG, Britain, and Italy to develop and manufacture a highly accurate LRSOM air-to-surface guided missile (with a range of up to 600 km) and an air-to-air missile of the AMRAAM type.

In the European NATO countries the proportion of military budgets earmarked for the production and purchase of combat hardware is steadily increasing. In Britain, for instance, this year it is 46 percent, as against one-third in the early seventies.

Particularly great hopes for harnessing the West European countries to the American-NATO military chariot on a long-term basis are pinned on the weapons required for the implementation of the NATO "deep strike" concept and on research under the American "Star Wars" program--or, to put it more simply, the program for the creation of space strike weapons.

The West German weekly DER SPIEGEL reported that according to statements by the heralds of the new NATO concept, the North Atlantic bloc will need some 4,000 highly accurate long-range missiles, as well as missiles for location-strike systems. But Washington does not think that is enough. For strikes against enemy airfields, it proposes--for dollars, of course--to site Pershing ballistic missiles and cruise missiles with conventional charges at bases in continental Europe, and Minuteman missiles, also with conventional charges, at bases in Britain.

As for the "Star Wars" program, as U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle has stated, the areas of joint research with the European allies could be laser technology, kinetic energy, radar systems, multiple nosecones for missiles, data processing systems, and so forth. Extensive,

Nonetheless the escalation of the arms race, leading to the stepping up of the West European countries' military and political dependence on the United States, continues. First and foremost through the imposition of American combat hardware. Here are just a few instances. The scandalous bribery of statesmen in the FRG, Italy, and other countries by the "death corporations" across the ocean with the aim of selling their air forces American F-104 planes which have the nickname "flying coffins" in Western Europe because of their frequent accidents, is well known. American F-4 planes, helicopters, surface-to-air guided missiles (Hawk, Improved Hawk, Nike Hercules), air-to-air missiles (Sidewinder), automated guidance systems, and other military hardware have also been imposed on the West European countries.

Four British nuclear submarines are armed with American Polaris A-3 missiles. The Conservative government intends to replace them with the improved Trident II missiles, also American. This replacement will cost 10 billion pounds sterling.

Joint production with the United States by a number of European countries has been organized for American F-16 and F-18 planes, the Stinger anti-aircraft missile complex (a total number of some 10,000 units by 1989), and multiple rocket launchers. Last year a consortium was created consisting of firms in the United States, the FRG, Britain, and Italy to develop and manufacture a highly accurate LRSOM air-to-surface guided missile (with a range of up to 600 km) and an air-to-air missile of the AMRAAM type.

In the European NATO countries the proportion of military budgets earmarked for the production and purchase of combat hardware is steadily increasing. In Britain, for instance, this year it is 46 percent, as against one-third in the early seventies.

Particularly great hopes for harnessing the West European countries to the American-NATO military chariot on a long-term basis are pinned on the weapons required for the implementation of the NATO "deep strike" concept and on research under the American "Star Wars" program--or, to put it more simply, the program for the creation of space strike weapons.

The West German weekly DER SPIEGEL reported that according to statements by the heralds of the new NATO concept, the North Atlantic bloc will need some 4,000 highly accurate long-range missiles, as well as missiles for location-strike systems. But Washington does not think that is enough. For strikes against enemy airfields, it proposes--for dollars, of course--to site Pershing ballistic missiles and cruise missiles with conventional charges at bases in continental Europe, and Minuteman missiles, also with conventional charges, at bases in Britain.

As for the "Star Wars" program, as U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle has stated, the areas of joint research with the European allies could be laser technology, kinetic energy, radar systems, multiple nosecones for missiles, data processing systems, and so forth. Extensive,

unprecedentedly costly work is planned. In the period from 1985 through 1989 alone it is planned to spend \$26 billion. The cost of the entire large-scale ABM system with space-based components, according to American experts' estimates, could exceed a trillion dollars.

But Washington is not guided solely by the desire to shift a sizeable share of this expenditure onto the NATO partners in its recruiting of supporters of space militarization among them. There are other, secret objectives too. For instance, by assuring to the allies' military-industrial concerns the role of subcontractors to the Pentagon and suppliers of new scientific and technical ideas, the Americans hope to penetrate their scientific and technological secrets, especially in spheres where the allies are ahead of the United States. And there are such spheres. As the magazine STERN reports, in connection with the question of West Germany's participation in the "Star Wars" project the FRG Defense Ministry has prepared a document which says that West German firms rank first in the world in the sphere of optical and sensory devices and hold a leading position in certain other spheres of scientific and technical research.

By placing the allies' financial, scientific, technical, and other resources at its own service, the Washington administration is trying to resolve another task--this time of a military-political nature: to give a NATO coloring to the Pentagon's adventures in space and make the European allies accomplices in the attempts to wreck the military-strategic equilibrium between the United States and the USSR and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

It cannot be said that Western Europe fails to see these dangers. French government leaders, for instance, have stated that France does not intend to participate in the implementation of the American "Star Wars" project, because it would start a new round in the arms race. There is growing opposition to the Pentagon's sinister plans in other NATO countries too. London's FINANCIAL TIMES characterizes their mood as follows: "Four years of Reaganism, first with his tough anti-Soviet rhetoric and now with 'Star Wars,' have made Western Europe increasingly doubt the American leadership's wisdom."

As for the European supporters of participation in the U.S. space adventure, they claim they support "only research work." As though they had never heard Pentagon chief C. Weinberger's categorical statement: "I exclude the possibility of the renunciation of strategic defense either at the research stage or at the deployment stage."

What this "defense" would mean for Europe was stated quite clearly by B. May, a member of the joint commission on defense and disarmament set up by the leadership of the British Liberal and Social Democratic Parties. Reagan's strategic defense initiative, he stressed, having the aim of shifting the arms race into space "on the totally fictitious pretext of the Soviet threat," ignores the true interests of Europe's peoples and their right to life and constitutes a "real threat to peace."

The peoples of the European NATO countries are increasingly resolutely demanding an end to the dangerous militarist policy of the bosses across the ocean.

WESTERN EUROPE

NORWEGIAN MINISTER SEES POSSIBILITY FOR MORE TRADE WITH USSR

PM250707 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 24 Jul 85 p 3

[Interview with A. Haugstvedt, Norwegian minister of commerce and shipping, by own correspondent, Ye Troitskiy: "Expanding Business Ties"--first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Oslo--A routine session of the Intergovernmental Soviet-Norwegian Commission on Economic, Industrial, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation was held recently in Moscow. Our own correspondent met Asbjorn Haugstvedt, Norwegian minister of commerce and shipping, in Oslo and asked him to answer a few questions.

[Troitskiy] How do you appraise the state of trade and economic relations between the USSR and Norway, Mr Minister?

[Haugstvedt] To be frank, I am not at all satisfied with the way our bilateral trade is developing. Norwegian exports to the USSR decreased considerably in 1984, and this year so far the same tendency is being observed. Although imports from the USSR increased, this was mainly on the basis of the delivery to Norway of traditional goods. There is a real need to diversify trade and exchange and supplement it with new goods. I believe, for example, that the Soviet Union has good opportunities to increase the sale to Norway of processing industry products.

The Norwegian Government supports the intention of the Kongsberg State Trading Company and the Norwegian Fellesbanken Bank to open their own offices in Moscow soon.

[Troitskiy] Are you satisfied with the results of the talks in Moscow and with the directions in the development of trade and economic relations approved at the latest commission session?

[Haugstvedt] The Moscow talks were frank and constructive and broached specific questions and projects. I would highlight the talks now under way on the construction in the Soviet Union of a factory to produce window units by the Norwegian "Blok-Watne" Company. The conclusion of such a contract would open up an opportunity for further cooperation in this sphere.

Norwegian industry's interest was confirmed in deliveries to the USSR of equipment and services to develop oil and gas deposits in the Barents Sea. It was noted that an important role here belongs to the "Bloconor" consortium, which includes seven leading Norwegian companies with considerable experience in opening up gas and oil deposits on the continental shelf. We believe that the discussion of proposals on participation by Norwegian companies and firms in developing the natural resources of the Kola Peninsula was also of great benefit. The Norwegian side is also interested in deliveries to the USSR of shipping and fishing equipment and technology and equipment used in the development of aquiculture. There are also several opportunities for expanding trade in computer equipment and cooperating on questions of hydroelectric power.

The Soviet side showed interest in the questions we raised and I hope that the upcoming talks between Norwegian companies and Soviet organizations will produce specific results.

[Troitskiy] What, in your opinion, is the influence of economic ties between countries on the climate of international relations?

[Haugstvedt] East-West relations depend on several factors. And I think--and I expect people will agree with me if I say so--that mutually advantageous trade between states with different sociopolitical systems has a profound and positive influence on the whole character of international relations. Lack of contact often leads to loss of trust. For this reason we favor expanding economic relations with the Soviet Union. If it proved possible to achieve specific results in bilateral trade, I think that then the way would undoubtedly be opened for a considerable expansion of economic ties between our neighboring countries.

CSO: 1825/100

WESTERN EUROPE

PRAVDA VIEWS IMPLICATIONS OF SPANISH GOVERNMENT RESHUFFLE

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 10 Jul 85 pp 1-2

[Article by Vladimir Chernyshev: "The Springs of Reshuffling"]

[Text] The government of Spain has been reorganised. There is a consensus of opinion among the political analysts that the Cabinet reshuffling pursued two aims. On the one hand, it was explained by the desire of the government chairman Felipe Gonzalez to "form a team of Ministers" which would correspond more to the "new stage" opened by the signing of the agreement on Spain's accession to the Common Market, and on the other by the intention to carry out a number of measures directed at enhancing the prestige of the government of the Socialists in connection with the elections to the Parliament to be held next year.

The political quarters link the resignation of Foreign Minister Fernando Moran specifically with the desire of the NATO circles to even more tightly bind Spain to the North Atlantic Treaty, including the accession to the NATO military structure. Moran, who had been against the accession of the country to NATO even before becoming head of the foreign-policy department, more than once expressed his disagreement with Atlantic solidarity, a line which precludes Spain's national interests, when Foreign Minister. The British OBSERVER, commenting on the resignation of this Minister, views it as clear evidence of the fact that the chairman of the government intends to keep Spain within NATO. In the newspaper's opinion, today, in the period preceding the national referendum on the country's participation in NATO, the question of organisation by the government of a propaganda campaign among the Spaniards with a view to convincing them of the necessity of Spain's participation in the North Atlantic bloc is coming to the fore.

It is also quite possible that the idea behind decision on the resignation of the Minister for Economics, Tax and Trade, Miguel Boyer, who caused broad discontent among the public by his actions aimed at "tightening the belts" of the population was "to sugar the pill". Under him the economic policy of the government encountered emphatic protests.

In any event, the manoeuvre with the reorganisation of the Cabinet is of a clearly political character. It was apparently dictated by the considerations testifying to the present Socialist government's ever more marked orientation to NATO, first of all the USA. Evidently, such a policy means abandonment by the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party of its election promises.

Madrid

66

(PRAVDA, July 10. In full.)

1812/299

WESTERN EUROPE

IZVESTIYA NOTES ICELANDIC VOTE FOR NUCLEAR-FREE STATUS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 85 p 4

[Article by N. Ivanov: "Iceland: For Nuclear-Free Status"]

[Text] Helsinki--The Icelandic Althing (parliament) unanimously adopted a resolution prohibiting the deployment of nuclear weapons in the territory of the country.

The deputies also declared themselves in favor of the complete prohibition of the testing and production of nuclear weapons. They demanded that the government cooperate in the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe.

The Althing resolution can hardly be called unexpected. The very fact that the representatives of various parties were unanimously in favor of the resolution says a lot. It has been nearly 10 years since the question of the "nuclear-free status of Iceland" was presented for parliamentary debate. At that time, the representatives of the People's Alliance proposed the drafting of legislation prohibiting the deploying and storing of nuclear weapons on the island. The government avoided such a decisive step but it was not able to diminish the fervor of the passions.

And these passions raged above all around the U.S. military base at Keflavik, which remains a source of concern and tension. More than once in Iceland, Washington was questioned about the presence of nuclear weapons at the base. And each time the Icelanders received evasive answers. But the facts have been accumulating, causing more and more concern.

In the opinion of D. Eytkin, staff member of the U.S. Center for Defense Questions, there is every reason to assume the existence of nuclear weapons at Keflavik. This was indirectly confirmed by the Icelandic newspaper T'ODU-VIL'INN, which published photographs of one of the base facilities under the code name "Patton Zone." The newspaper asserts that the electronic equipment in operation there reminds one of the defense system for nuclear facilities in the United States. But this time as well, Washington gave an evasive answer, declaring that the question of the deployment of nuclear missiles and warheads will be resolved in accordance "with NATO defense strategy."

Subsequent events showed the hypocrisy of American assurances. Icelanders recently found out that Pentagon safes have long held a secret plan providing

for the deployment of 48 depth bombs with nuclear charges on the island in the event of a crisis situation. When reports of U.S. plans reached Icelandic newspapers, they provoked a storm of indignation and became the object of sharp debates in parliament. All attempts by Washington to calm the passions were without results. Even the visit of U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz to Reykjavik failed to relax the situation.

Prime Minister S. Hermannsson asserted that without the consent of the Icelandic Government the United States has no right to bring nuclear weapons onto the island even under the conditions of war. Minister of Foreign Affairs G. Hallgrímsson added: Iceland will not only not permit the keeping of nuclear weapons on dry land but the prohibition also applies to the appearance of warships and aircraft with nuclear weapons in the ports and the air space of the island.

The current decision of the Althing is a new step on the way to affirming the nuclear-free status of Iceland. The parliamentary resolution reflected the striving of Icelanders to be active in support of the process of disarmament and the declaration of northern Europe as a nuclear-free zone.

9746

CSO: 5200/1185

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

TASS OFFICIAL ASSAILS U.S. POLICIES IN REGION

AU260601 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 7, Jul 85 (signed to press 19 Jun 85) pp 98-107

[Article by Yu Romantsov, deputy director general of TASS, former TASS correspondent in the United States and Latin American countries: "Brigandage Under the Mask of 'Democracy'"]

[Text] In recent years, particularly since Washington proclaimed its infamous "program of democracy and public diplomacy," the U.S. Administration has tried to conceal its aggressive actions against the countries of Latin America with a mask of "democracy." However, the pivot of U.S. ruling circles' policy in relation to Latin America has always been and still is a course aimed at keeping this region dependent on American capital. Striving for domination over the countries of Latin America, Washington has never been ashamed to resort to the most unbridled methods of brigandage, robbery, and blackmail. And to this day the "Monroe Doctrine," which appeared as early as 1823, is followed in American diplomacy. Basically, this doctrine reserved colonial domination on the American continent exclusively for the United States. Later Washington armed itself with the slogan of "Manifest Destiny" based on the claim that "God Himself" gave the North Americans a "civilizing" mission with regard to their southern neighbors. The appearance of such a demagogic credo was caused, in particular, by the necessity to "substantiate" the seizure of a vast part of Mexican territory.

At the beginning of this century President T. Roosevelt came forward with theses which consolidated the "right" of the United States to interfere in the affairs of any country in the Western Hemisphere which, in Washington's opinion, was "following a path of anarchy" or was guilty of "chronically illegal actions." With the aid of the direct use of military force the United States has tried to impose its will on Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Haiti, Panama, Chile, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Grenada. Some of these countries or parts of their territories have been subjected to prolonged occupation. By means of annexation the United States has turned the island of Puerto Rico into a colony.

In addition to its "gunboat diplomacy" and its counting on "the big stick," the U.S. ruling class has also sought more "peaceful" means of expanding and consolidating its domination in Latin America. In this respect a distinctive landmark was President W. Taft's proclamation of the policy of "replacing bullets with dollars," which was aimed at the economic enslavement of countries in the Western hemisphere. Well-known as "dollar diplomacy," it is still widely practiced by U.S. state monopoly capital as a means of perpetuating the dependence of countries in this region on their "northern neighbor."

In recent decades the changing of signboards on U.S. Latin American doctrines and programs has continued. Euphonious labels have appeared, such as the "good neighbor policy," "Alliance for Progress" and so forth. However, the essence of these policies has remained the same: consolidating to the maximum U.S. strategic positions and ensuring the most advantageous conditions for the activities of the American monopolies.

As far as the present administration is concerned, then its aspirations are determined by a revival of the most ominous aspects of the "Monroe Doctrine," which dictate that Latin America be kept in the position of a political and economic backyard of the United States. The current ideological interpretation of the "Monroe Doctrine" gives first place to preventing "alien," that is, Marxist-Leninist, ideology in the Western Hemisphere.

It is not difficult to note that the Latin American policy of the present administration seems to fall into two component parts. For the White House and Congress, relations with the countries of Central America and the Caribbean Basin stand in the foreground, and the increased attention to them on the part of the highest echelons of power is not only a tribute to those stormy events which recently swept this region. "Since the 1898 Spanish-American War," writes G. Uiard [as transliterated], professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts, "the Latin American concerns of U.S. strategists have mainly been focused on those countries adjacent to the Caribbean Sea which are located in close proximity to America's southern borders...around its 'soft underbelly.'" ¹

The second component of Washington's Latin American policy is its relations with the states of South America. These are mainly studied by territorial subdivisions of the State Department for, unlike Central America, in the opinion of American strategists South America is not at present experiencing a "conflict situation." At the same time Washington strategists are worried by the growing anti-American sentiments in this region, which are based on the hard living conditions of the working masses, their poverty, and unemployment--the results of countries on this continent being dependent for decades on the octopus-like monopolies of the United States and other imperialist powers.

At present the task of smothering revolutionary Nicaragua is of paramount importance in the Central American policy of the White House. The U.S. President considers it his duty to turn to the problems of Nicaragua almost every day without troubling himself with objective appraisals of the policies of this genuinely independent state in Central America. He accuses the Sandinist government of "repressing its people" and of supposedly arming "communist terrorists"--"with the full support of Cuba and the Soviet bloc"--while granting them its territory "for attacks on neighboring states."² In his turn, Secretary of State G. Shultz, who has made "international terrorism" one of his favorite propaganda subjects, tried to involve Latin American "governments friendly to the United States" in "multilateral efforts" against this "new barbarity" ("terrorism"). "The Organization of American States and its members," said Shultz, "must act while taking an obvious fact into account: an attack by terrorists or partisans on any democratic state is an attack on all democratic states."³ The new doctrine, which Shultz calls "antiterrorism," into whose coils the United States would like to lure Latin American states, is primarily directed against revolutionary Nicaragua and also national liberation and patriotic forces in Central America. Its shock force is the multithousand army of CIA hirelings made up of Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries of all colors. The "Contras" are trained and armed by American imperialism, loyally serve it, and use openly terrorist, bloody methods against the Nicaraguan people.

Although the terms "Contras" in the eyes of the world community has long become a synonym for terrorists, nevertheless Washington leaders continue to call them "Freedom Fighters," an alliance with whom is nothing other than "self-defense" by the United States, which is supposedly in accordance with the UN Charter and the Charter of the Organization of American States. Carried away by frankness, the U.S. President even called the Nicaraguan CIA hirelings "our brothers." Another time he chose a visit to the White House by Argentinian President Raul Alfonsin as an occasion for extolling them. According to Alfonsin this disturbed him, and he deemed it necessary several days later to say at a press conference in Houston: "We need a political solution (to the problems) in Central America. We cannot sacrifice the security of the region for the sake of the security of the United States."⁴

Washington does everything possible to raise the spirits of the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries and to turn them into an efficient force which could carry out large-scale actions against Nicaragua. The U.S. President frankly discussed this in a radio address to Americans on 16 February 1985: "How can we deny them assistance, when we know that ultimately their struggle is our struggle? We must remember that if the Sandinists are not stopped now they...will spread communism to El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras, everywhere."

Thus, by resorting to old wives' tales about the danger of communist ideology spreading, the administration can indulge itself in brigandage. It is not for nothing that L. Motley, assistant secretary for inter-American affairs, holds forth on the theme that "military exercises, naval maneuvers, and internal opposition (armed and unarmed)" are, quote, totally legitimate and justified "means of pressure" which America is simply "bound" to use in relation to Nicaragua in order to change "the conduct of the Sandinists."

Such an impudent demand on the Sandinists is a new element in Washington's strategy. According to appraisals in the American press, demands that the Nicaraguan powers change their "conduct" coupled with the attitude toward the bandits and counterrevolutionaries as "freedom fighters" and toward Nicaragua as a country "behind the Iron Curtain" signify attempts by Washington to create a political, economic and ideological cordon around the independent republic.

Not restricting itself to measures of "psychological war," at the beginning of May this year the White House declared a trade embargo on Nicaragua. The national leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation front and the revolutionary government of Nicaragua, as well as the broad world public appraised the American boycott as another step along the path of Washington's preparation for direct military intervention in the republic.

Of course, it is well understood in the U.S. capital that the Sandinists do not intend to "change their conduct," despite threats of reprisals. Consequently advocates of an imperial course make it clear that the screws will be tightened even more and American interference in Nicaragua's internal affairs will assume an even broader scale. Attempts have long been made to intimidate the revolutionary government with the aid of reports on "extreme plans" worked out in Washington, clearly hinting that their ultimate aim is its overthrow. At one of his press conferences the U.S. President gave a basically affirmative reply to the question of whether the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government is the aim of the administration's policy.

While engaging in open brigandage in relation to Nicaragua, Washington lavishes honeyed speeches about its imaginary loyalty to a peaceful settlement of the situation in Central America. In particular it tirelessly repeats its support of the "Contadora process." But no sooner did Nicaragua announce in September last year that it was ready to sign the document "The Peace Act," drawn up by the Contadora Group (Mexico, Venezuela, Panama, and Columbia), than the United States urged its Central American clients to put forward reservations to this document. Then it broke off bilateral negotiations with Nicaragua which were taking place in the Mexican city of Manzanillo and gave additional "explanations" of its idea of the tasks and aims of the "Contadora process."

From this "explanation" published in February 1985 by the State Department, it appears that the United States basically seeks the unilateral disarmament of Nicaragua (and this when an undeclared war has been unleashed against it!) and tries to dictate its internal political structure to it, as well as with whom and how to build its relations in the international arena. In particular, it discusses "democratic pluralism" which, in Washington's interpretation, means admitting "armed and unarmed opposition" to power--in other words, those very counterrevolutionaries who have stained their hands in the blood of the Nicaraguan people and who the master of the White House has called "our brothers."

With the aim of reducing tension in Central America as rapidly as possible, Nicaragua offered a new peaceful initiative in the middle of May 1985, proposing to the Honduran authorities a plan for settling the border conflict which has been kindled between the two countries by counter-revolutionary Somoza bands. Nicaragua proposed disarming these CIA hirelings with the mediation of the International Red Cross or other analogous organizations.

The American administration ignores the will of the Nicaraguan people, which was expressed at the genuinely free elections held for the first time in this country's history in November last year, when the democratic nature of the young republic was plainly demonstrated. The administration strives for a "democracy" in Nicaragua and neighboring states which would suit the most reactionary circles of American imperialism and tie in with their plans to perpetuate their domination in the Western Hemisphere.

Of course, if one takes on faith the statements of both the secretary of state and L. Montley, assistant secretary for inter-American affairs, the United States is exclusively concerned with ensuring that "democracy" should triumph in Central America. The future of democracy is at stake in Central America, the Secretary of State told senators at the beginning of this year. However, the "arguments" to which Washington resorts in order to justify its aggressive, brigand-like course in relations to Nicaragua are of such a false nature that even the American press cannot remain silent on this. In an article entitled "Democracy for Latin America is Hardly Reagan's Concern," placed in the newspaper THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, a member of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, P. Bell emphasizes that the present administration dons the garb of champion of "democracy" in Latin America in order to "justify its support of regimes whose main feature is their rabid anticommunism." 5

As examples for emulation Washington cites pro-American regimes which cruelly suppress their own peoples. Thus, without embarrassment the U.S. Secretary of State names among those countries in which in recent years "military rulers or dictators have been replaced" supposedly by "leaders elected by the people" . . . El Salvador and Grenada, and claims that Guatemala is supposedly "making a transition to democracy."

As far as the El Salvador and Guatemala regimes are concerned, it is well known that they represent specimens of state terrorism and social injustice not only on the Central American but also on the world scale. According to information provided by the El Salvador Human Rights Commission, members of punitive expeditions of the armed forces and ultra-rightwing groups killed 2,233 peaceful citizens in El Salvador in 1984 alone. And in the last 4 years, more than 50,000 people have lost their lives in that country in the bloodshed unleashed by the authorities. This is how the American weapons generously supplied to the puppet regime by the United States are used in that country.

Washington bases its conclusion about the "democratic" character of the El Salvador regime on the fact that, in May last year, "elections" were held in El Salvador although it is known that the elections were not only staged at the insistence of the United States but were also financed by American sources. Only candidates who were completely to Washington's liking were allowed to run in the elections. And since then the policy that suits the United States has been carried out in that country not by the odious military junta but by "elected president" Jose Napoleon Duarte. The signboard has changed but the essence of the policy based on terror has remained the same. The new puppets continue to exterminate their own people at former rates (according to information provided by El Salvador's democratic organizations, in the first 3 months of Duarte's government, the "death squads" killed more than 400 people and kidnapped for political reasons another 100 people). Nevertheless, the U.S. Department of State immediately fabricated the "evidence" of a reduced scale of violence in that country. And this, in its turn, provided the "ground" for the White House to earmark in the current financial year a sum of \$70 million for El Salvador especially for military purposes, that is, in fact for reprisals against the patriots, in addition to the previously released sum of \$126 million.

This year, American diplomacy is trying to organize an analogous farce with "elections" in Guatemala. Hence Washington's arguments about a process of transition to "democracy" which has allegedly begun in that country. However, the matter stands differently in real life. According to the estimates of the Washington research organization, the Council for the Affairs of the Western Hemisphere, in 1984, the "security forces" killed 3,000 to 5,000 people and another 1,500 Guatemalans were listed as having "disappeared without trace." The White House has requested \$35.3 million for military deliveries to Guatemala for the next financial year as compared to the sum of \$300,000 appropriated for the current financial year. The Administration's representatives have substantiated this "jump" by directly linking it with the promises of Guatemala's military authorities to hold "elections."

Within the framework of the anti-Nicaraguan campaign the Pentagon has firmly consolidated its presence in Honduras, a country which, together with El Salvador and Guatemala, has been turned by Washington into a

U.S. support base in the Central American Region. American geopoliticians regard these three countries together as a base for expanding the U.S. military-political and economic positions in all of Latin America. As far as Costa Rica is concerned, according to press reports, the United States has acquired the "right" to periodically land there the marines from the ships cruising along the Central American coasts. The landing of 500 military personnel in the port of Limon took place, for instance, in February 1985.

Reports have appeared in the foreign press that the Pentagon is soliciting the installation of military bases on the territory of Belize. Manuel Esquivel, prime minister of that country, has considered it necessary to point out that he has no intention of admitting the Pentagon to his country. However, the very fact of the growing appetites of the U.S. militarist circles convincingly confirms that the democratic forces of Central America are right to warn the peoples of the continent against the increased threat to their sovereignty from American imperialism.

Washington's strategy in relation to Grenada must be especially mentioned in this connection. This strategy reflects as clear as day everything that the "cowboy diplomacy" and the implementation of the goals of the most reactionary U.S. circles that strive to arrange the fate of large and small peoples of Western Hemisphere at their own discretion, bring not only to the countries of the Caribbean basin but also to Latin America.

The seizure of Grenada by the American military forces in October 1983 was a scandalous act of completely overt aggression. The UN General Assembly characterized it as a "gross violation of international law and an encroachment on the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of that state." But the chief of the White House continues to claim: "We do not need to excuse ourselves for anything. Our military forces acted in the best traditions of our country."

The consequences of the U.S. lording it over the island are indicative. The unemployment which the democratic regime had succeeded in reducing to 12 percent has once again jumped to 48 percent. The state farms have been denationalized and handed over to latifundia owners. The doors of the schools built under M. Bishop's government have been closed. Free medical services for the population have been abolished and foreign doctors have been expelled from the country. Crimes, drug addiction, and speculation have become widespread. The Point Salinas civilian airport, the island's first international airport, which Cuban builders were building under the supervision of the British firm Plessey, is used by the American interventionists primarily as a military base. On the whole, the country has been thrown back politically, economically, and socially to the time of dictator Gairy when the American monopolies and the top local comprador clique bossed it over everything. It is as the American organization "Grenada Foundation" justly says: "The invasion has destroyed Grenada."

The aim of that destruction was not only the liquidation of the progressive undertakings of M. Bishop's government but also the establishment by force of pro-American political institutions and the imposition of activities of private entrepreneurs with a preference for monopolist capital.

By carrying out last December the "elections" the preparations for which had taken more than 1 year but which were nevertheless rigged in order to ensure the desired results, the United States formalized the "democratic" character of the puppet regime headed by Herbert Blaize, who inaugurated his term of administration by requesting the U.S. President prolong the stay of American troops in the country for an indefinite period.

Long before the "elections" the American Agency for International Development inspired certain reforms on the island to "stimulate the activities of the private sector." And in its turn the IMF, which is controlled by the United States, proposed a broad program of "economic stabilization." The basic provisions of the program are: a further reduction in the number of jobs, lower wages for workers, abolition of price controls, and granting additional privileges to private foreign companies.

The reprisal against Grenada was expected to serve as a lesson and warning to others and to intimidate those who had embarked or planned to embark on the road of social transformations that would challenge U.S. domination in the region. One year after the intervention the head of the American Administration declared that the intervention had put an end to the U.S. "lack of self-confidence" and represented a "turning point" (?) in U.S. history. Observers appraised that statement as the Administration's order for further brigandage.

And it is no accident that Grenada, together with several other east Caribbean states, has been assigned a noticeable role in the pro-American military-political grouping that, acting under the leadership and in the interests of Washington, is expected to perform police functions in the Caribbean Basin and, first and foremost, to suppress the national liberation movements.

The first practical steps have been already taken to carry out this project. As the press has reported, American instructors are training in Grenada a gendarme corps which includes a special paratrooper detachment trained in the methods of "antiguerrilla warfare." There have been reports about the formation of analogous special-purpose detachments in St. Christopher and Nevis, about the training by American instructors of the officers of "regional naval forces" in Barbados, and about the construction of naval vessels for the east Caribbean puppet regimes in the American shipyards.

The Pentagon tries to press down not only former colonies but also the territories that even now still have a colonial status. According to the working document prepared by the UN Secretariat in the last summer, 10 percent of the territory of the Bermuda Islands which are administered by Britain have been set aside for the American naval and air bases. In 1983 American Pershing II missiles were tested in the Bermudas without the knowledge of the local authorities.

Noteworthy in connection with the current activities of the United States in that region was the "Caribbean Conference" that was held at the University of South Carolina in the city of Columbia, South Carolina in July last year and in which heads of states and governments of 13 Caribbean countries and territories that are "friendly to the United States," including the rulers of occupied Grenada, participated. Although the conference was formally of a "private nature," the U.S. President delivered a speech at the conference in which he praised the regimes that have opened wide the door to the American monopolies as an "example for developing countries everywhere."

And thus Washington is turning the Caribbean region into a testing ground where new forms of enslavement of developing countries are being worked out. One of these forms is also the "Caribbean Basin Initiative" of the White House. Revealing the strategic goals of that "initiative," the American TIME magazine called it a "political tool aimed at preventing internal disturbances in a region that has become ripe for leftwing revolutions."⁶ In other words, although the White House's plan is presented as primarily an integrated economic program designed, in the president's words, to "help our neighbors help themselves," it is in fact expected to solve the political and economic tasks of American private capital. As the Jamaican newspaper STRUGGLE noted some time ago, we are dealing with the "expansionism and military offensive of imperialism."⁷

STRUGGLE knows what it is saying. In recent years Jamaica has opened wide the door to large American capital. What have been the results of this? Behind the show window of imaginary development there are 27 percent of the country's active population who are unemployed. Last year the country's foreign debt amounted to \$2.7 billion and 40 percent of the budget revenue was earmarked for its repayment. The output of the country's main export product, bauxite, decreased by one third and many enterprises of that branch operated at half their production capacities. Other countries of the region are also experiencing similar consequences of the implementation of the "Caribbean Basin Initiative."

The prescriptions according to which the U.S. Administration acts in Central America and the Caribbean basin also provide the basis for its policy further south, in all of Latin America, with some modifications or other depending on the conditions in each specific country. Chile has been assigned a special place in the South American strategy.

Recently Washington has also tried to rank Chile's fascist government among those who are moving "toward democracy." For instance, L. Motley, who held talks with Pinochet and other leaders of the military junta and representatives of the rightwing parties in Santiago in February this year, says: "The United States wishes to see the restoration of the tendency of (Chile's) transition to democracy." Motley made it clear that the United States most certainly has no objection to the hangman of the Chilean people staying in power until 1989, that is, until the time set by himself, and then being "elected" for a term of 8 years as a "constitutional president." He emphasized that the "movement toward democracy" must be carried out in the "calmest, moderate, and peaceful form" and once again blasphemously claimed that the overthrow of S. Allende's government by the fascist putsch in September 1973 allegedly "improved the atmosphere" in Central and South America.

Under the cover of talks about "democratization" Washington is actively laying the ground for closer and wider ties with the Pinochet clique. Thus, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which is controlled by the United States, is considering the question of granting a loan of \$600 million to Chile. Practical steps to resume American weapons deliveries to Chile, suspended by the Carter administration under public pressure, were first discussed with the Chilean "gorillas" by L. Motley and, after him, by N. Sanchez, U.S. assistant secretary of defense for inter-American affairs, during his visit to Santiago. It was not without ground that Admiral J. Toribio Merino, member of the military junta, in his conversation with journalists, expressed hopes that the deliveries of American weapons to Chile would soon be resumed.

It is not difficult to answer the question why Washington has moved toward strengthening its ties with Chile with such great zeal precisely now. On the one hand, the regime is increasingly threatened by mass popular actions and a noticeably intensified activeness of the progressive and democratic forces; on the other, it is threatened by political trends in South America which now are clearly not developing in favor of the United States.

After decades of military dictatorships, two South American giants, Brazil and Argentina, as well as Uruguay, have returned to the constitutional form of government. The new civilian governments of these countries have embarked on a course of democratization of political life, of solving the extraordinarily complicated economic problems created under the conditions of dominance of foreign monopolist capital encouraged by the military rulers, and of following a foreign policy based on the principles of respect for sovereignty and noninterference.

Thus, in order to strengthen democracy, the program of the new Brazilian Government, called the "New Republic", envisages the convocation of a National Constituent Assembly next year, the implementation of a series of reforms in the sphere of legislation, including, in particular, the

introduction of direct and general presidential elections, the abolition of the undemocratic "press law," and the reorganization of the National Information Service, used by the military regimes as a repressive police apparatus, into a "technical organ."

At his swearing-in ceremony in March 1985 J.M. Sanguinetti, new president of Uruguay, emphasized the important of returning the country to a democratic form of government and declared that his government would develop comprehensive cooperation with all countries of the world regardless of their sociopolitical formations.

The Argentine civilian authorities have not only broken with the repressive past practice of the military regimes but have also brought to trial a group of high military officials on charges of unlawful arrests, torture, murder, and other crimes. Three former presidents, Jorge Videla, Roberto Viola, and Leopoldo Galtieri, are among the accused.

Leftwing political parties and groups, driven underground by military rulers, are returning to the political arena in these countries. For instance, in Uruguay the Communist Party has been legalized and the ban on its press organ, the newspaper POPULAR, has been lifted.

The voices of protest against the economic dominance by foreign, primarily American monopolies that extort profits of \$25 billion from the Latin American economy annually and, for all practical purposes, control its industrial production, are growing stronger and stronger. In 1984, the foreign debts of Latin American countries, which mainly resulted from the shackling conditions of loans and financial speculations of the state monopolist capital, reached the astronomical sum of \$360 billion. The neocolonialist plunder fetters the economic development of Latin American countries and causes mass unemployment and scandalous poverty among the working people. According to the information provided by the Panamerican Health Organization, 1 million children die from hunger in Latin America every year.

One of the main "think tanks" of the present administration, the politically conservative Heritage Foundation, has prepared for its second term the report entitled "Mandate for the Country's Leadership--2." Its Latin America section includes a package of recommendations calling on the U.S. authorities to intensify the methods of dictate, pressure, and sabre rattling. Washington is expected to "restore unity" in South America on an anticommunist basis and to strengthen the "special relations between the United States and Latin America."

Life convincingly shows every day the existence of a deep gap separating the goals and interests of the Latin American peoples and those of the U.S. imperialism. The contradictions between the United States and Latin America are intensifying as a result of unequal commodity trade conditions that promote the enrichment of monopolies, as a result of the

dominant positions captured by foreign capital in the national economies, as a result of the plundering of the fishery resources of the Latin American coastal countries by U.S. pirates, and so forth. Antagonism between them also arises in the United Nations and this was demonstrated, for instance, by the UN Security Council's consideration in May this year of the dangerous situation in Central America which was caused by the U.S. anti-Nicaraguan plotting, including in particular economic sanctions. Representatives of Cuba, Brazil, Mexico, and Peru criticized the U.S. Administration's policy of pressures and threats. Representatives of the Latin American states pointed out that the "Contadora process," envisaging, first and foremost, the right of the region's peoples to self-determination without any outside interference, represents the only basis for settling the situation in Central America.

Cuba, the first socialist state in the Western Hemisphere, staunchly defends peace, true national independence, and equality in international relations, and shares the cares and interests of Latin America. Despite the blatant anti-Cuban campaign unleashed by Washington, Cuba continues to advocate a dialogue with the United States (of course, a dialogue under conditions of equal partnership) and has more than once demonstrated its good will with practical actions. This just and principled position and its impressive socioeconomic achievements during the years of people's power have earned it wide respect. The struggle for an immediate resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba is spreading in countries such as, for instance, Brazil, that had severed them at one time under the pressure from Washington and still have not resumed them. Trade, cultural, and sports relations between Cuba and its neighbors are increasing.

The facts unambiguously show that the main goals of U.S. policy in Latin America at the present stage are to preserve, consolidate, and further expand its dominance in the region, to safeguard unhindered the predatory activities of American monopolies that have already put the sovereign states in a position of permanent debtors, and to make the Latin American states join the policy of confrontation with Cuba and Nicaragua in the Western Hemisphere.

These goals are alien and directly opposed to the interests of a majority of Latin American countries that consistently work to consolidate peace and peaceful cooperation on the continent and to solve the ripe economic and social problems along the path of independent development.

FOOTNOTES

1. CURRENT HISTORY, Feb 85, p 49.
2. "Vital Speeches of the Day," Feb 15, 1985, p 261.
3. Department of State Bulletin, Jan 85, p 66.

4. GRANMA WEEKLY REVIEW, April 7, 1985, p 2.
5. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, Mar 22, 1985, p 6.
6. TIME, 8 March 1982.
7. STRUGGLE, 8 April 1982.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", "Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn". 1985.

CSO: 1807/404

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

ULTERIOR MOTIVES ALLEGED IN U.S. STANCE ON MEXICAN DRUG TRADE

Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 85 p 3

[Report from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent S. Zavorotnyy in Mexico:
"They Miscalculated.... Why Washington Needed a 'Campaign of Narcoterror'"]

[Text] This is possibly the best role ever of the current United States ambassador in Mexico, the former Hollywood actor, John Gavin.

"We are here now," the voice of the ambassador quavered tragically, "to see off for the last time from Mexico to the United States Enrique Camarena, associate of the Drug Enforcement Administration...."

Not one detail is neglected in his appearance: the sadness in his voice, the furrowed brow.... The zinc coffin with Camarena's body is slowly raised on board the special airplane which will take the dead man from the Mexican city of Guadalajara into sunny California.

What did Camarena do to deserve such bright honors, which have so far not been awarded to a single one of his colleagues killed at various times in carrying out their official duty? Why did Camarena's murder twice cause the United States to unilaterally partially close the border with Mexico at the very height of the tourist season?

After Camarena's funeral, all major newspapers of the United States devoted extensive articles to him, declaring Mexico to be the devil incarnate, a country of narcotics dealers, and they made Camarena into the only hero, who perished fearlessly in order to protect the American land from Mexican narcotics. Things have come to such a pass that American legislators have threatened Mexico with various types of economic sanctions. The reason: too slow an inquiry into the murder case of E. Camarena. The outburst of libelous, or simply abusive statements against Mexico has reached its apogee. None other than United States Secretary of State G. Shultz announced in the Senate:

"Our patience with Mexico has exceeded all bounds."

Why did the official figures in Washington need all this? The White House knows very well what a diseased attitude American society has toward the

problem of narcotics. The United States has long been the main consumer of narcotic substances.

But what does neighboring Mexico have to do with this? In order to answer this question we must recall: both in structure and its methods of work, the Drug Enforcement Administration, created in 1973, precisely copies the CIA. Moreover, the espionage department has put at the disposal of its "younger brother" its best associates, and also part of its budget. In the opinion of English researcher A. Henman, many tasks which were formerly placed on the CIA have been transferred to the Drug Enforcement Administration, and its activity has gone beyond the field of fighting the narcotics mafia and embraced the sphere of economic and political pressure against people who are not pleasing to the government in Washington.

In September of last year, the American newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote ironically that Jamaica long ago became the second most important supplier of marijuana to the United States. But the Reagan administration, as the newspaper emphasized, consciously closes its eyes to all this, since the pro-American government of Jamaica is faithfully serving its masters in the White House. As for Bolivia, Washington gave a hostile reception to the democratic government of this country, and did not hesitate to accuse Bolivian powers of complicity in the production of narcotics. This same fate also befell Mexico, whose "crime" against the White House consisted of persistently refusing to subordinate their policies in Central America to American interests.

The tragic death of the associate of the American Drug Enforcement Administration, who was killed by the mafia in the Mexican city of Guadalajara, became grounds for organizing a campaign to discredit Mexico. American newspapers, as if on command, with one voice began to accuse their southern neighbor of all the mortal sins: robbery, corruption, violence, which they said were swamping Mexican cities. And all of this, the newspapers asserted, is because Mexico is in no condition to cope with the mafia in its production of narcotics.

Oil was more than once poured onto the fire of the anti-Mexican campaign by the American ambassador to Mexico himself, J. Gavin, who in the course of a press conference made unsubstantiated hints that the drug dealers have "protectors in high places." But the "matter of narcotics" was transparent. Washington required the libelous sensation in the American press only in order to blacken Mexico, to present it to the entire world as the chief supplier of narcotics to the United States, and to represent the Mexicans as the sort of killers and aggressors who stand outside civilization.

The "campaign of narcoterror," as it was aptly named by Mexican journalists, was aimed at undermining Mexico's international positions and forcing it, in particular, to give up its active role in the "Contadora Group," whose efforts for a peaceful resolution of the Central American conflict are arousing the sharp displeasure of the Pentagon. But Washington made an error in its calculations: Mexico did not give way to the usual pressure on the part of its northern neighbor. This is attested by the statement of the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which decisively condemns the economic boycott of Nicaragua announced by the Americans. Washington has still not comprehended that Mexico does not make deals with its foreign policy.

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

SOVIET WEEKLY ASSAILS JAPANESE INTEREST IN SDI

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 26, Jun 85 pp 12-13

[Article by Y. Tavrovsky: "'Land of the Rising Sun' and 'Star Wars'"]

[Text]

After a tour of the Uchinoura Space Research Centre on the island of Kyushu we walked down to the rocky sea shore where the launching pads of the Japanese Institute of Space and Aeronautical Science were situated. On the way down Dr Minoru Oda, director of the centre, told us correspondents about the EXOS-C satellite which was to be launched the next day, the forthcoming studies of the density of ozone in the upper atmosphere, "black holes" and novas. Somebody asked him whether Japanese scientists would help develop the permanently operating manned space station the U.S. President had mentioned. "That isn't an easy question at all. I shall try to answer it a little later," Dr Oda replied politely.

We learned the answer at the foot of a multistorey launcher with a silvery three-stage rocket "glued" to it.

"This is the N-2 rocket, Dr Oda explained. "It is a faithful reflection of the present condition of Japan's space technology. It was built under U.S. licence in Japan. Some of the components are 'black boxes' delivered from overseas and Japanese specialists are forbidden to study their design. But nevertheless this rocket is an achievement, because in the past rockets consisted practically solely of components made in the U.S.A. The situation with satellites is a little better. The

one we are orbiting tomorrow is 98 per cent Japanese. It should be mentioned that the Tanegashima launching site, run by the National Space Development Agency (NASDA) is still orbiting communications and weather satellites that have either been purchased from the U.S.A. in toto or are largely made up of imported units and assemblies.

"This is due to the fact that both the scientific and applied Japanese space programmes have only recently been started. Under U.S. occupation all work on rocketry was banned. The first rocket with a weight of 700 grammes and a length of 23 centimetres—was launched only in 1955. That was known as the 'pencil' rocket. The first Japanese satellite was put in orbit as late as 1970. The launching of 'working' vehicles, first the Himawari weather satellites and later the Yuri communications satellites, was begun on a regular basis in 1977. They were orbited from U.S. grounds and only 15 per cent of their equipment was Japanese-made. The year 1981 witnessed the birth of second-generation Japanese satellites which, 30 to 60 per cent Japanese-made, were launched from Japanese territory. It is worth noting that the trouble the Yuri-2a and the Himawari-2 satellites developed shortly after being orbited in 1984 was due precisely to the imported units. Our desire to become completely

independent both in rocketry and in the construction of satellites is easy to understand. The new space programme provides for the development by the early 1990s of an H-II Japanese rocket which would be capable of orbiting a two-ton payload, six times more than the present 'work horse'—the N-2—can cope with. And although a Japanese astronaut is to go up on board a U.S. Shuttle in 1988, we dream of using our own carrier-rockets for manual space flights.

"And now," Dr Oda said, "let's go back to the U.S. space station project. Like other Japanese researchers, I am eager to take part in it. We could learn a lot and also share our achievements. What is troubling us is the possibility of military applications of the station. If it is confirmed that the project has a 'military lining,' we will have to refuse to take part."

Dr. Oda's misgivings about the officially proclaimed "absolutely peaceful" nature of the space station are not unfounded. Commenting on the project, the Japan Times, a paper close to the Japanese Foreign Ministry, wrote: "The indications are that the U.S. station will serve more than peaceful purposes." The weekly Far Eastern Economic Review informed its readers that "NASA is maintaining an active liaison with the U.S. Air Force space command and the U.S. Navy space command to ensure that the space station's design is not incompatible with future possible military uses of the station." A group of leading Japanese scientists recently demanded that the government should guarantee them the right of non-participation in projects that contributed to the formation of a military-industrial-scientific complex in Japan. This demand also covered research in rocketry.

The answer to the question about Japan's participation in the development of the space station was, in effect, given at the end of last year when the government allocated 1.5 billion yen to work in pursuit of the project in 1985. On May 9 this year, an agreement was signed in Tokyo on the conditions and forms of Japanese participation at the initial stage of the project. It is assumed that similar documents will be signed as progress is made on the station,

which is due to be orbited in 1992-93. By then, Japanese outlays will have amounted to 300 billion yen, i.e., approximately one seventh of the total cost of the project. U.S. spokesmen have suggested that their Japanese colleagues should carry out 14 programmes in the development of the station. However, the Japanese scientists were not satisfied with the minor role offered to them and announced their intention of producing their own laboratory module.

The military-industrial concerns are eager to participate in the project. The Mitsubishi, Ishikawajima Harima, Toshiba and Mitsui companies have all set up special research centres. Without waiting for an official government decision, the Japanese military agencies started work, in September 1984, on secret "star war" programmes. The U.S.A. has made inquiries about anti-satellite homing systems, and Japanese specialists have been studying the performance of two types of laser weapons.

The Japanese companies not only hope to snatch a tasty morsel in the form of contracts from the government-subsidized Space Agency. By cooperating with U.S. contractors, they also hope to "borrow" scientific and technological information in order to reduce the gap in space technology.

The hopes and calculations of Japanese firms and government agencies are, of course, no secret to their U.S. partner-competitors. Aviation Week and Space Technology has already commented on NASA's intention of taking "protective policy measures" against information leakage to Japan. However, in the matter of Japan's participation in the U.S. space programme the U.S.A. itself seems to be the more interested party.

There are several reasons behind this. Washington is eager in particular to shift part of the burden imposed by the arms race onto Japan and its other allies. Furthermore, though the Americans have been scornful of Japan's space programme, they have been compelled to admit that the Japanese lead in several narrow fields of electronics, robotics, laser technology, the manufacture of new materials and

miniaturization. No wonder Washington has put powerful pressure on Tokyo to create a mechanism for the transfer of new Japanese technical developments to the U.S.A. This mechanism is the Joint Military Technology Commission. The U.S.A. is very interested in Japan's gallium-arsenide semiconductors, optical fibres and artificial intelligence (fifth-generation computers).

In an attempt to draw Tokyo into the crazy "star wars" scheme Washington has already promised Japan "protection" by means of the planned space weapon system. Just as in the case of the "nuclear umbrella" provided under the terms of the U.S.-Japanese Security Treaty, the new level of "protection" may turn out to be an even greater threat to Japan's national security, a further infringement of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

But the men in Tokyo do not think so.

During the meeting of the Seven in Bonn early in May Ronald Reagan met Yasuhiro Nakasone, the Japanese Premier, and urged Tokyo to join the "star wars" scheme. The local press pointed out that Nakasone in fact supported the U.S. President's call.

Are the Japanese ruling circles aware of what many Japanese have long realized, namely that the militarization of space would accelerate the arms race and, far from decreasing the threat to the whole of mankind, would actually increase it?

CSO: 1812/300

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

ISRAEL CP LEADER CALLS FOR END TO ISRAELI AGGRESSION

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 85 p 4

[Article by Meir Vil'ner, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel: "Defending Justice and Peace"]

[Text] Israel is a capitalist state which is closely tied to the military-industrial complex of the USA. It conducts an aggressive policy; holds Palestinian, Syrian, and Lebanese territories under colonial occupation; and together with the United States hinders the resolution of conflict in the Near East and the establishment of a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace.

The foreign policy of the ruling Zionist circles of Israel consists not only in striving to enlist American support for the annexation of the occupied territories, in exchange for serving the global strategy of the USA in the region. It also has a real ideological basis (podopleka)--class hatred for communism, and above all for the bastion of peace and socialism, the Soviet Union. The Israeli-American agreement about "strategic cooperation" officially defines the Soviet Union as the enemy of Israel. Anti-Soviet campaigns take place constantly in the country, which weren't even stopped on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany.

Our party struggles against anti-Soviet propaganda with all its might. We explain that the Red Army and the Soviet people were the decisive force which, in breaking the back of the vicious Nazi beast, saved millions of Jews from annihilation. We remind them that the Soviet Union supported the resolution of the UN General Assembly in 1947 which approved the creation of two independent states in Palestine, one Jewish and one Arab, and from that time it has never changed its position. We emphasize that today the Soviet Union supports Israel's right to sovereign existence and at the same time justly opposes its aggressive policy, demanding withdrawal from all territories occupied since 1967 and the creation of an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel. We affirm that the peace-loving Soviet policy in regard to the Near East takes into account not only the interests of the Palestinian people, but also simultaneously the genuine interests of the Israeli people, who are now living in a powderkeg.

As a result of the recent parliamentary elections, which took place in mid-1984, a government of "national unity" was created in Israel. The two main political blocs formed it: Likud--the coalition of the upper bourgeoisie and the "hawks" of the extreme right, and Maarkh, where the basic force is the Israeli Labor Party. There is no essential difference between these two blocs, neither in questions of foreign policy, nor in economics, nor in the social sphere. Alongside them in the government there are the representatives of the reactionary religious parties, on a platform which is essentially that of continuing the policy of Likud, which governed the country from 1977 to 1984.

The concise expression of the government platform in foreign policy would be the word "no!" No to withdrawal from the west bank of the Jordan River and from the Gaza strip and the Golan Heights, which Israel has occupied since 1967; no the creation of an independent Palestinian state; no to recognition of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO); no to the convocation of an international conference to establish peace in the Near East, under the aegis of the UN; no the participation of the Soviet Union in the resolution of the Near East conflict; no to complete withdrawal from Lebanese territory to internationally recognized borders. The only "yes" is for strategic alliance with the USA.

The present government was formed in conditions of the deepest economic, social, and moral crisis in the country's history. Huge military expenditures have brought Israel to the brink of economic bankruptcy. Its foreign debt amounted to 31 billion dollars. Inflation reached a record 445 percent last year. The government of "national unity" has cruelly attacked the wages and standard of living of the workers. With the consent of the leadership of the trade union Histadrut, which is under the control of the Maarakh bloc the real income of the population has begun to fall.

For the first time, the government budget for 1985-86 is figured not only in Israeli shekels, but in US dollars. This is understandable, for the value of the shekel is falling every day. The government budget exceeds 23 billion dollars. Out of this, 54 percent goes for the payment of debts which were caused by previous military expenditures, chiefly by purchases of American armaments. Another 24 percent is allotted to current military expenditures.

As a result, appropriations for education, health, and social needs have been sharply cut. Unemployment has grown. According to estimates, by the end of 1985 it will reach 150,000 people, approximately 10 percent of the country's entire work force.

The US administration increased by 400 million dollars its gratis military aid to Israel, which next year will amount to 1.8 billion dollars. However, this aid doesn't cover even half of current military expenditures, which are an unbearable burden on the shoulders of the workers. Along with this, the incomes of the large capitalists, who become rich from inflation, the exploitation of the occupied territories and the construction of settlements, and from the war in Lebanon, are growing.

The decision of the government on the "disengagement of forces" in three stages in Lebanon was a consequence of the failure of Israeli-American

aggression in this Arab land. Israel has lost more than 5,000 soldiers killed or wounded. It was precisely the struggle of the Lebanese people against the occupation, causing new losses for the Israeli army every day, which forced Israel to decide to retreat. Also, mass protests within Israel against the presence in Lebanon played an important role.

However, the government is trying to deceive public opinion. The government's plan is to hold a belt along the border of southern Lebanon under constant, albeit masked, Israeli control. In this belt, with the help of the Israeli army, the "southern Lebanese army," which consists of hirelings, will rule. Israel has also kept the "right" to invade far to the north; it will also in the future exercise "control" over Lebanese air space and territorial waters.

The government, together with the US administration, is preparing a new conspiracy. It is trying to again incite civil war in Lebanon. In recent weeks, Israel has conducted pogroms in southern Lebanon. They are reminiscent of the atrocities committed by the American aggressors in Vietnam, and even the horrors of the Second World War.

American imperialism and the ruling Zionist circles of Israel are making maximum use of the lack of unity among the Arab states, and in the ranks of the Palestinian people and its sole legitimate representative--the PLO. They are trying to drive the Palestinian people to despair and to implant a defeatist spirit among them.

The slogan "Peace in exchange for land," advanced by King Hussein at the Palestinian National Council in Amman and included in Hussein's and Arafat's agreement, falls short of the demand that Israel withdraw from all territories occupied since 1967. The agreement does not speak clearly about the creation of an independent Palestinian state, and there is a dangerous retreat from the principle of independence of the PLO.

"Mubarak's initiative" was a continuation of the Hussein-Arafat agreement. It concerns separate talks of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation with the US administration. There will be no representatives of the PLO in the joint delegation; it will have Palestinians acceptable to the USA and Israel. Like the Camp David deal, "Mubarak's initiative" pursues the goal of forcing the PLO to renounce its independence and consigning to oblivion the rights of the Palestinian people. The essence of this initiative lies in "achieving a territorial compromise"--in attaching part of the occupied West Bank to Jordan and in the annexation of the remaining part by Israel.

All of these actions of King Hussein, President Mubarak, and certain circles within the PLO are based on the false premise that the national rights of the Palestinian people can be obtained as a boon from the hands of American imperialism. But the USA is not prepared to pressure Israel, which has great "strategic importance" for it.

Our opposition to "peace American style" comes from the fact that it proposes not peace, but a renunciation of peace. Remember, peace Camp-David-style led to the war in Lebanon. The strategic goal of the so-called "Reagan plan" is the creation of an aggressive military bloc in the Near East with the participation of Israel and the reactionary Arab governments.

The USA's Near East policy is an inseparable part of its global drive to intensify tension and confrontation. Thus the struggle for peace in the Near East cannot be separated from the struggle for peace in the whole world.

The path which will lead to peace in the region is not the path of defeatism, but of struggle against the policy of American imperialism and the ruling Zionist circles of Israel. The struggle takes place in the international arena; in the Near East it is carried only by the Palestinian people, Syria, the Lebanese patriots, and by all anti-imperialist Arab forces; and in Israel itself by the proponents of peace, who understand that in the final analysis, the adventurist policy of aggression, occupation, and "strategic alliance" with American imperialism threatens not only the security of Israel, but its very future. In this struggle, the preservation of the PLO's unity on an anti-imperialist independent basis will have enormous significance.

We, Israeli communists, believe that it is correct to concentrate our struggle in Israel against the occupation of the conquered lands; for a just peace, in which the rights of all peoples and states will be secured, including the Palestinian Arab people and Israel; for the convocation of an international conference on the Near East with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO, and also the USSR and the USA. We demand the immediate, complete, and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from Lebanon to internationally recognized borders, and the end of any sort of Israeli interference in the affairs of this sovereign state. We call for a fundamental change in the aggressive Israeli policy, for a policy of peace and independence, nonannexation and neutrality, and we demand the annulment of the strategic alliance with the USA.

The extended occupation and war in Lebanon has led to the movement of the internal politics of Israel further to the right. Extremist-minded fascist and racist forces have raised their heads.

Against these forces, against the danger of fascism, a mass movement has arisen in which people holding various ideological and political views participate. Political and social polarization has sharply increased in the country. Reaction is using a new tactic against us. During the last elections a so-called "Progressive list for peace" was created, the representatives of which, advancing slogans on the Palestinian question similar to ours, actually are pushing forward the American plan for a Near East settlement. But even in these complex circumstances we have not only maintained our positions, but even strengthened them.

The Communist Party of Israel and the "Democratic front for peace and equal rights," the core of which is our party, carry on a constant struggle against the policy of the ruling circles, and do everything for the mobilization of as wide as possible a front. The strength of our party is in its Marxist-Leninist ideology and faithfulness to the principles of internationalism, in the unity of the Jews and Arabs in its ranks, and in the fact that we defend the authentic national interests of the Israeli and Palestinian peoples, the interests of the workers of Israel, and the interests of peace and progress.

The light at the end of the Near East tunnel is, nevertheless, not visible. But we are struggling with heads held high, because we are certain of the rightness of our chosen path.

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

ROOTS OF LEBANON CONFLICT EXAMINED, FUTURE SEEN UNCLEAR

Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 15, 5-11 Apr 85 pp 12-13

[Article by Pavel Demchenko, international-affairs journalist, PRAVDA editorial college member and editor of the developing countries department: "Lebanon--a Martyr-Country, a Warrior-Country"]

Excerpts/Starting its drive into Lebanon, Tel Aviv figured that with Washington's active and wide-ranging support it would in the shortest possible time bring that country to heel and transform it into a strong-point for further expansion. Tel Aviv was convinced that Lebanon, weakened as it was by civil war, unabating discord and rivalries between the religious-political communities and feudal clans, could not stand up to the powerful military machine of Israel. But the aggressor miscalculated. The resistance mounted by the national-patriotic forces of Lebanon has forced the aggressor to begin a retreat; it has foiled Israel's plans, none of which were in fact implemented.

I set out for Lebanon with a feeling of excitement. This small Arab country has in recent years become an arena of stormy events that for months have held the attention of the world press. Concentrated here, in an area of a mere 10000 sq. kilometers, are practically all the complex contradictions, political, religious and social, that for a third of a century have been tearing apart the vast Middle East. And yet, in its hour of terrible ordeal, a bleeding Lebanon has unexpectedly for many displayed a true fighting spirit, producing one surprise after another and forcing both the American generals and the Israeli interventionists to give it their undivided attention.

What does the country look like and how does it live after many years of civil war, Israeli rapine and a deep split among the internal political forces?

To better understand why the situation has changed so much we must hark back to the peculiarities of the country's political structure, review the changes that have taken place in recent years in Lebanese society itself, especially in the wake of the Israeli aggression of 1982.

What Is Confessionalism?

History and geography have provided Lebanon with a special place in the Middle East. It has long been regarded as a crossroads, a transshipping point on the road between East and West. There were very good grounds for this: the Lebanese bourgeoisie, especially the merchants, utilizing the know-how handed down from Phoenician times, not unsuccessfully played the part of go-betweens in trade and financial deals. It is through Lebanon and its intricate banking system that Western capital was channeled after World War II, and it is through the same system that the profits of the cartels found their way back to the West. Petrodollars at first also flowed out of the Arabian Peninsula by way of Lebanese banks. And when Egypt, Syria and Iraq enacted laws nationalizing foreign capital and putting a stop to the activities of foreign corporations, Lebanon, it seemed, came into full bloom: new banks, as well as subsidiaries of scores of companies, were established. In the eyes of many, the country was wallowing in luxury and wealth. Not the entire country, to be precise, but Beirut and its resort environs where many modern hotels, restaurants, casinos, splendid shops sprang up and the publishing business boomed.

Looking back today, however, you see through the shroud of the tempests that swept over Lebanon that all this was no more than the facade of a country where the political balance hung by a thin thread. The solution of problems affecting the bulk of the population was put off till future times, the state structure fell further and further behind the needs of the day.

The historical development of the small territory occupied by Lebanon has made it the home of over 15 religious faiths, communities and sects. Also a historical reality is the fact that for many centuries during the periods of Osman and then French colonial rule the powers that be wanted supporters of the various religious faiths not to unite but, on the contrary, to live apart. That is why when Lebanon was granted independence in 1943 the country's machine of state was organized on the basis of confessionalism, that is - on the religious principle.

Agreement on this point was reached by the notables of the time who were in the main representatives of major feudal-bourgeois Maronite Catholic and Sunni Moslem clans. It is they who above all came to share all the power, formalizing the deal in a National Pact which became as binding as the constitution. It stipulated that the president of the country could only be a Maronite, the prime minister a Sunni Moslem, and the speaker of the parliament a Shiite Moslem. The Druze (representatives of a distant offshoot of Shiism) and the Orthodox Christians were provided with, as a rule, one ministerial post each. In accordance with the then assessed composition of the population it was decided to elect 5 Moslems for every 6 Christian members of Parliament.

The composition of the state apparatus, the officer corps and, consequently, budgetary expenditures were all made to accord with the demands of confessionalism. Such a situation not only led to the strengthening of the clans' role in Lebanese society, but intensified class inequality and political antagonisms, even though it seemed that with the years the existing feudal-religious framework had begun to crumble. Several dozen political parties were organized in the country. Some of them, like the National Liberal and the Kataib parties, represent the Maronites, the Amal organization - the Shiites; there are two or three Armenian parties.

In addition to this there are other parties and organizations that function on a non-religious basis. Such are, for example, the Communist party, the party of Arab Socialist Renewal, and so on. Originally established as a purely Druze organization, the Progressive Socialist party (PSP) gradually found supporters among other groups of the population. Some of these parties formed their own armed militias which grew in importance after the Lebanese army practically disintegrated in the course of the civil war that erupted in the country in 1975-1976.

The local bourgeoisie and shopkeepers managed to turn the appearance in Lebanon in 1948-1949 of the first wave of Palestinian refugees, expelled from their native parts by the Israelis, to their own advantage by using these impoverished newcomers as a cheap, almost gratuitous workforce without any rights. The Israeli aggression of 1967 against Egypt, Syria and Jordan seemed at first to have bypassed Lebanon which for a few more years remained an island of peace and prosperity amid the stormy waves of the Middle East.

In the early 70s, however, it became clear that the country had entered into a bitter social crisis that stemmed from acute class inequality. The bloc of progressive parties took to the offensive against confessionalism. These events coincided with the appearance on Lebanese territory of the leading organs and armed units of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The leftist parties and a number of Moslem factions established close ties with the PLO and lent support to the Palestinians' struggle against Israel. The Kataib party defended the principles of confessionalism, it called for the ouster of the PLO from Lebanese territory, claiming that the actions of the Palestinians would provoke an Israeli strike. Several other Christian organizations who thought it would be impossible to remove the Palestinians from Lebanon came up with proposals to limit the activities of the PLO by putting the Palestinians under strict control and inviting UN troops to the country to fence it off from both Israel and Syria.

In a word, there were as many positions as there were parties. The intensity of the struggle reached such a pitch that civil war broke out in 1975, the government was paralyzed and the armed militias

of the parties and organizations became the deciding force. To separate the warring factions, in the summer of 1976 Syria, at the request of the Lebanese government, introduced its troops into the country. By decision of the League of Arab States, these were transformed into the Inter-Arab peace-keeping forces in Lebanon. The conflict was quelled for a time, but no reconciliation between the opposing sides was achieved and no shift occurred in their positions.

The Kataib party, seeing it had no allies left in the country, practically isolated the territory it controlled (East Beirut and some 800 sq.kilometers north of it) from the rest of Lebanon and entered into collusion with the USA, France and even Israel. The Sunni bourgeoisie, together with several small Christian factions, attempted to mediate between the leftist and conservative blocs, the Syrians and the Palestinians, basing its efforts on the assumption that Lebanon is part of the Arab world and therefore one must look for the solution of the intra-Lebanese and Palestinian problems in the mainstream of Arab politics, not in secret deals outside their framework.

Such was the situation in the country when it came under the threat of Israeli aggression whose hardships were multiplied by internal discord and internecine strife. The absence of national unity, of a solid alliance with neighboring countries and a clear-cut position on the Palestinian issue translated for the Lebanese people into a prolonged and cruel tragedy.

One Aggression Replaces Another

The claps of thunder heralding the approach of a major storm resounded in March 1978. Israeli troops invaded Lebanon and occupied its southern part. They met with resistance from several Palestinian contingents and the armed militias of leftist factions who could not halt or slow the advance of Israel's massive mechanized columns. Many peasants (the figures quoted were from 60 to 200 thousand) fled north from the aggressors. The units operating in those parts, which pompously called themselves "the army of South Lebanon" and numbered about 2000 men, mostly Christians, turned into open collaborationists and agents of Tel Aviv. At that time, however, the Israelis did not succeed in staying on in Lebanon. After destroying the base camps of the Palestinians, perpetrating pogroms in refugee camps and a score of Lebanese villages and reinforcing their henchmen, they withdrew. To achieve the disengagement of the opposing forces, the UN sent its provisional troops to southern Lebanon. They are there to this day.

The almost complete impunity of this aggressive sortie, the growing support lent Israel by the U.S. all played a role in Tel Aviv's decision to subject Lebanon to another attack in June 1982, this time with far larger forces. Sowing death and destruction, the

Israeli army occupied the entire South, besieged Beirut and even seized its western part for a time. The leadership centers and armed contingents of the PLO were forced to leave the Lebanese capital after a defense which lasted almost 80 days. A Syrian armored brigade likewise evacuated Beirut, and the threat of a massive Israeli attack loomed large over Syrian forces in the Bekaa valley. It should, moreover, be borne in mind that Israeli troops, having occupied several hills in eastern Lebanon, were poised only 30-35 kilometers from Damascus, in other words, acquired the capability to shell it with long-range artillery.

Even more ominous was the fact that American marines landed in Lebanon for the first time since 1958 and the Sixth Fleet approached Lebanese shores. Its ships trained their guns on resistance centers and time and again opened fire on them with their heavy guns. American flags appeared in the Beirut airport and on the seaside beaches. The marines' headquarters moved into an imposing building in one of the capital's suburbs.

Everything seemed to be going the imperialists' and Zionists' way, especially since many Arab countries sat back and watched events unfold and were in no hurry to come to the aid of the Palestinians and the Lebanese. It even came to the point where the Lebanese government, many of whose then members were appeasers and Western sympathizers, was pressured by the U.S. into concluding an unequal "peace agreement" with Israel.

All of a sudden the picture began to change rapidly; a lot of surprises ensued. A small Arab country with a population of about three million and an army ill equipped for action, a nation weakened by prolonged internal strife, Lebanon proved to be a hard nut for the aggressor to crack. The U.S. marines, after suffering substantial losses (over 260 dead alone), had to withdraw from Lebanon in disgrace, and the 6th Fleet to move further away from its shores. The Lebanese-Israeli agreement was abrogated by a new Lebanese government. The Americans were followed out of the country by the French, Italian and British commando contingents which constitute the "multinational forces" and which had also suffered casualties. "It is amazing how quickly everything fell apart," wrote NEWSWEEK. "With surprising speed Syrian-supported factions seized control of almost all of Beirut and surrounded the U.S. marines in Beirut Airport."

And now, finally, Israeli troops are leaving Lebanon too. They have already withdrawn from Sidon and its environs, and by June 1, as announced, will clear out of Lebanon altogether. Tel Aviv is trying to present the move as redeployment, a voluntary step in the framework of long-range policy, but that is mere propaganda. The real picture is totally different—the aggressor is being forced to retreat. The operation against Lebanon, code-named "Peace to Galilee" and launched in June 1982, was originally depicted as an easy prom-

enaded through a small Arab country. The soldiers were told that the entire campaign would last a maximum of 2-3 weeks. However, it proved to be the longest war in Israel's history. In the end the strain on the aggressor was such that he could bear it no longer.

The Lebanese venture cost Israel about 650 dead and 4500 wounded, and these figures continue to grow. The cost in money terms is over 3.5 billion dollars. The Begin government, which started the war, has lost the country's confidence. Begin himself not only had to step down as prime minister, but to terminate his political career as well; his party lost the parliamentary elections held last summer. The slogan calling for the withdrawal of their troops from Lebanon was supported by hundreds of thousands of Israelis, it has become one of the most popular in the country.

"Israel's decision to effect a phased withdrawal from Lebanon," wrote the BALTIMORE SUN, "is an admission of defeat after the most catastrophic military venture in the country's history." One cannot but agree with such an assessment, but let us not forget that the Lebanese tragedy is not over, Israeli rapine continues. In the course of their current withdrawal from Lebanon the invaders have declared an "iron fist" policy and are lashing out, so to speak, in every direction.

In this context it is interesting to note that the propaganda pretext for Israel's invasion of Lebanon in June 1982 was the necessity to put an end to "Palestinian terrorism". And it is the Palestinians who bore the brunt of Israeli repression in the initial stages of the occupation. However, after a short period of time the invaders became targets of attacks in many other areas, especially the Shuf mountains with their predominantly Druze population. The Israeli command decided to pull out of that region, and the fires of the resistance now burned with growing fury in the South. At the head of the struggle there stood the Lebanese Patriotic Resistance Front. Tel Aviv's official communiques, in addition to "Druze terrorism," began referring with increasing frequency to "Shiite terrorism."

The Shiites comprise the majority of the population in south Lebanon, but the facts reveal that not only they took up the struggle for liberation. At the offices of the Beirut paper AN-NIDA I was presented with an album featuring photographs of over 20 communists who died in concentration camps established by the Israelis or in battles with them. Several issues of this outlawed newspaper were clandestinely Xerox-printed. In them were brief reports on operations carried out, on the terror conducted by the invaders, slogans and appeals to join in the struggle.

As evidenced by the correspondent of the Paris newspaper MONDE, "the resistance movement was started by leftist forces, primarily

the communists. And though today it is indisputable that most of the participants are Shiites, in the beginning it was organized by communists... Christians have been and continue taking part in operations just like the Sunnis and the Druze."

In a word, this was no terrorism, but justified actions by patriots. Perhaps it is precisely the scope of the guerilla movement in a country gripped by internal strife, a movement which has assumed national proportions, that came as the biggest surprise to the Israelis and their American sponsors. As broader segments of the population joined in the struggle, the ministers the U.S. and Israel relied on were removed from the cabinet. The political factions with whose aid these two countries hoped to reinforce their position in Lebanon were defeated and driven into a corner.

It must be borne in mind that the government of Lebanon and the country's progressive forces coordinate their actions with Syria. This coordination has proved quite effective. Lebanon simply could not have held out had it been left to confront Washington and Tel Aviv one on one. The Syrian leadership took upon itself the role of mediator in intra-Lebanese disputes, of a singular guarantor of Lebanese independence. It has displayed an enviable fortitude in the face of American-Israeli pressure.

The Difficulties of Solving the National Problem

Al Hamra Street in Beirut was once considered the bourgeois center of the city with a distinctly pro-Western slant. Hotels and shops, numerous movie houses aped European and American names. The lights were bright, the residents, to use a phrase, "upper crust," life was expensive.

Today much in the image of Al Hamra has changed. Like in other parts of the capital, life on the streets dies down before dark, there are few people, the shopwindows are screened by iron shutters. The five-story "Mayflower" hotel where I stayed had only four guests: there is no tourism, business is almost dead. On the walls of many buildings portraits have appeared of the Iranian ayatollah Khomeini and another oldster in a black cassock. On other buildings are portraits of Nabih Berri, leader of the Shiite organization Amal.

The resolute emergence of the Shiite community on the political arena is one of the phenomena of recent Lebanese events. A mere 10-15 years ago the Shiites played no significant role either in politics or the economy. The National Pact had determined their numbers as the third largest in the country, and accordingly they were allotted just so many parliamentary seats. Furthermore, theirs was allegedly a closed community living by its own inner laws, the educational and property levels were considered the lowest in the country.

But now, when hundreds of thousands of southerners have fled north to escape the tyrannical rule of the Israelis and the South itself is in the grip of a fiery struggle for liberation, it has become especially evident that the demographic and political composition of society has indeed changed. The Shiites are now in first place. There are over a million of them, about one third of the entire population. Understandably, they are demanding reforms in the system of government, greater representation in the organs of power and the liquidation of confessionalism.

Politically, Shiism is not homogeneous. There are organizations like "Khizb Allah" (The Party of Allah) and "Al Jihad al Islami" (Islamic Holy War) which are oriented toward Iran and preach asceticism and self-sacrifice in the struggle against Israel and the U.S. Then there is "Amal" which represents the majority, fields the largest armed forces and at the same time occupies a more moderate position, declaring that it is fighting for the "unity, territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Lebanon."

The new balance of forces in the country is perceived with particular dismay by the Maronite community, more accurately by the Kataib party. It has come to the point where the party's armed units, called "Lebanese forces", last March rebelled against the authority of the political leadership. Their grievance against, among others, President Gemayel (a Maronite himself) was that his support of the national unity slogan and his acceptance of Syria's right to arbitrate Lebanon's internal affairs would inevitably lead to the loss by the Maronites of their privileged status in the country and, perhaps, the post of president. And this, they allege, would dissolve the Christians in the Moslem mass.

The raging conflict is a struggle between two directions in the development of Lebanese society. One is aimed at achieving national consensus, the other at fanning intercommunal discord, at keeping part of the population, especially the Shiites, in an inferior position, and this the latter cannot accept. The "Lebanese forces" have once again slammed shut the doors leading into the part of Lebanon they control, which serves as an ominous reminder of the fact that the country still has a long way to go in the matter of unification.

You come across confirmation of this at every step. Some parties now have at their disposal their own, as they are called here, "illegal" ports where cargoes from abroad are shipped in without benefit of customs control. Kataib has its "own" pier even in the port of Beirut. I had imagined that the whole affair involved a few small cases or bags clandestinely put ashore, but seeing one of these ports in the outskirts of Beirut, I was forced to change my mind. In broad daylight a large crane was transloading sealed containers from a ship's deck to heavy trucks which immediately drove off into town. It became quite clear whence the abundance at Lebanese bazaars of South Korean, Taiwanese, Hong Kong and Singapore goods.

In these circumstances Israel, while retreating from Lebanon, has not given up attempts to subvert the unity of the country. It is pinning all its hopes on intercommunal conflicts, Christian and Moslem rivalries which it is doing its utmost to intensify. However, the provocative maneuvers of the Israelis have met with resistance from, above all, the national-patriotic forces. By drawing into their fold people of the most varied religious backgrounds— Sunnis, Shiites, Druze and Christians of various denominations— they are slowly laying the foundations for rebuilding the shaken national unity of Lebanon.

Tiny Lebanon, buttressed by Syria, has indeed demonstrated its unbending and freedom-loving character. However, a great many problems there have yet to be resolved. The Lebanese face a difficult task— to bring order to their own house, end all discord, arrive at a genuine national consensus and, of course, finally rid themselves of the invaders' presence.

12258

CSO: 1807/345

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

THE 'ISLAMIC FACTOR' AND CURRENT ANTICOMMUNISM

Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 13 Jun 85 p 3

[Article by M. Usmanov, Dr of Philosophical Sciences: "The 'Islamic Factor and Current Anticommunism"]

[Text] In the psychological war, which imperialism is conducting on a hysterical anti-Soviet and anticommunist note, special emphasis is being laid on the religious question, and the utilization of the so-called "Islamic factor" is now being turned into an organic part of the ideological diversions of the United States against the USSR and the countries of the socialist commonwealth. At the same time, the goal is being set to strengthen the shaken positions of the United States in the Muslim countries.

It must be emphasized that the struggle of the peoples of the East under the slogan of Islam here and there acquired a patently antiimperialist and, above all, anti-American character during the past few years. This was manifested especially distinctly in the struggle of the Iranian, Palestinian, Lebanese, and a number of other peoples. In the Islamic countries, with the exception of a number of reactionary regimes that are under economic and political pressure of the United States, there has been an intensification in antiimperialist sentiments.

The imperialist policy of dictation, threats with respect to the developing countries of the East in general and the Muslim countries in particular is assuming an increasingly tough and open character and is being accompanied by unbridled slander of the Soviet Union. The enormous achievements in socio-economic progress of many developing countries after the attainment of independence, above all, are the reason for this. In the process of the struggle of the peoples for national liberation and for sovereign development, an enormous interest and propensity for socialism as a society of justice, democracy and progress, awaken in them. Among the ideologists of imperialism, this calls forth not only anxiety for their own interests, but also hatred and anger toward the socialist countries. They are making enormous efforts to prevent contacts between the Soviet Union and the Muslim countries and to slander socialism.

"One does not have to possess special political vision to see how imperialism during the past few years has intensified its subversive work," comrade M.S. Gorbachev emphasized at the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

The propaganda centers in the West have begun to make frequent mention of "the Islamic factor", putting into this concept a properly political content, and they use Islam in the struggle against socialism and simultaneously for the strengthening of their positions in the countries of the Near and the Middle East.

The political activization of Islam is occurring as an objective process since the perennial attempts of the imperialists to inculcate the bourgeois way of life called forth an enormous protest on the part of the Muslim peoples and gave rise in many Muslim countries to the tendency to return to their historic and religious conceptions of fundamental values.

The traditional influence of Islam on various spheres of the socio-economic and spiritual life in these countries remains still strong: The Shari'a regulates the socio-economic, legal and moral norms; influential classes and strata exist that are interested in the strengthening of the position of religion; religious organizations and the clergy have at their disposal large financial and economic possibilities; and the norms of Islam exert a strong influence on the education and training, the culture, everyday life and traditions of the peoples.

The activization of the role of Islam manifests itself especially distinctly in the past few years in the advancement of Islamic slogans in socio-political processes and revolutionary movements taking place in Muslim countries. Moreover, these slogans are being utilized both in democratic movements and by reactionary forces aspiring to preserve and strengthen conservative regimes.

The attitude of our state to the Islamic slogans is clearly formulated in the materials of the 26th CPSU Congress, where it is said: "In some countries of the East Islamic slogans are being advanced in recent times. We, communists, have an attitude of respect for the religious convictions of people professing Islam, as well as other religions. The main issue is the goals that are being pursued by the forces proclaiming slogans of one sort or another. A struggle for liberation may develop under the banner of Islam. This is indicated by historical experience, including very recent experience. But it also speaks to the fact that reaction, which stirs up counterrevolutionary revolt, operates with Islamic slogans. The whole point, therefore, is what the real content of a particular movement is."

In the process of the intensification of the liberation struggle of the peoples of the Muslim countries, there has been a noticeable increase in the tendency of the consolidation of the Muslim countries. Previously such a tendency manifested itself mainly on the level of religious Islamic, social and state organizations, such as the World Islamic Congress, the League of the Islamic World, and the Islamic Council of Europe.

The creation, in 1969, during the period of the height of the Arab-Israeli conflicts and contradictions, of an inter-governmental organization of the Muslim countries--the Organization of the Islamic Conference--signified, on the one hand, a higher level of consolidation of these countries, and, on the other, indicated the increase of anti-imperialist tendencies. At present the Organization of the Islamic Conference unites 43 states and the Palestine Liberation Organization; its legislative organ is the conference of the heads of state and

governments, convened once every 3 years; and the executive organ is the conference of the ministers of foreign affairs, who meet annually. The Muslim population of the member countries of the Organization of the Islamic Conference now comes to 535 million.

At its sessions, the Organization of the Islamic Conference has repeatedly adopted anti-imperialist and anti-American resolutions and has called for the unification of forces in the struggle against Zionism. This seriously worries the United States, which tries to exert pressure on the Organization of the Islamic Conference, utilizing for this purpose the reactionary regimes that are obedient to it. The American imperialists are actively trying to direct the movement of the Islamic peoples into an anti-Soviet channel. The administration of the United States pretends to be the friend of Islam, disseminates hypocritical statements about its sympathy for the Muslim peoples, combining this with comprehensive support of the Israeli Zionists, who have seized Arab lands and who are destroying the peoples of Palestine and Lebanon.

The White House tries to exert influence on the activity of the international Islamic organizations, above all the Organization of the Islamic Conference, to weaken the anti-imperialist direction of their activity, and to strengthen anti-Soviet and anticommunist tendencies in them. The 15-year activity of the Organization of the Islamic Conference indicates that in the political line of this organization, along with the preservation of anti-imperialist tendencies, anti-Soviet attacks also find manifestation.

Islam represents a powerful factor in the international arena. There are now approximately 800 million Muslims in the world (this does not include the number of believers in the USSR). They represent the majority of the population in 35 countries, and in 19 countries the absolute majority (i.e., 95 percent and more), in another 18 countries--an influential minority, and in almost 40 countries Islam is recognized as the state religion.

The plan of the utilization of the "Islamic factor" of the United States envisages economic, political and strategic goals. In the economic respect, imperialism regards the Muslim countries as a most important source of resources. In these countries, two-thirds of all the oil deposits of the capitalist world are concentrated, they supply 70 percent of the total import of oil of the countries of the West and America, and they have at their disposal enormous unused raw material resources that are extremely necessary for present-day engineering and technology. During the postwar period, the oil companies of the United States seized control of the exploitation of oil over an enormous part of the region--in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, and others. In many countries of this region, the United States placed its military bases. All of this illuminates clearly enough the reasons for the activation of the policy of the United States in the Muslim countries. For the realization of this policy, all methods and means are set into motion, but the lie and misinformation remain the chief means. On the one hand, the ideologists of imperialism, even of figures of the highest rank, like Reagan and his administration, attempt to show themselves as true friends of Islam and the Muslim peoples. But at the same time, they arm and encourage the Israeli expansionists to kill the peaceful inhabitants of Palestine and Lebanon and they provoke intrigues and disagreements among the Muslim countries in order to bring them

into collision with one another and to distract their forces from the anti-imperialist struggle.

Characteristic in this respect is the undeclared war of imperialism against revolutionary Afghanistan. Under pressure from the United States, the reactionary regimes of the region have extended and are extending enormous material assistance to the counterrevolution. At the beginning of the this year, the United States announced the allotment of \$280 million in assistance to the murderous Afghan formations for the current year, and from 1979 to the present such assistance has already reached \$625 million.

It must be especially emphasized that the ideological centers of imperialism during the past few years have intensified the anti-Soviet and anticommunist propaganda aimed at the Muslim countries; they have spread lies and slander about the Soviet order and the reality of socialist society, having laid special stress in this on the Islamic question.

However, the peoples of the developing countries of the East, including the Muslim peoples, see with their own eyes the selfless assistance of the Soviet Union and its support of the national liberation movement and the aspiration for progress. Support of the developing countries and peoples logically flows from the foreign policy of the USSR, the slogan of which is peace, democracy and progress.

8970

CSO: 1807/358

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

PRAVDA CITES PDRY LEADER ON SOVIET AID

PM211101 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 June 1985 first edition carries on page 4 a 1,500-word Aden, June dispatch by own correspondent V. Peresada under the heading "In the Arabian South."

Peresada outlines the achievements of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY] in economic development and agrarian reform and describes its fight against the 1982 flooding and the drought of 1984, citing Muhammad Sulayman Nasir, PDRY minister of agriculture and agrarian reform, who notes the "large amount of aid" rendered by Soviet specialists in building dams.

The dispatch goes on to describe the campaign to wipe out illiteracy in the PDRY, briefly mentions a sea water desalination complex which is being constructed with Soviet assistance, and notes the development of the Yemen Socialist Party:

"Our party is steering its projected course on the basis of an unshakable principle: operating in the interests of the working masses and relying on the masses," 'Ali Nasir Muhammad, general secretary of the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee and chairman of the PDRY Supreme People's Council Presidium said "We regard the party's link with the working people as the cornerstone in ensuring economic, social, and cultural development. In strengthening this link the Yemen Socialist Party will continue to direct its efforts toward improving the people's material and spiritual living standard. We assess highly the Soviet Union's international aid, which is helping the PDRY's successful advance along the path of progress."

Finally Peresada outlines the PDRY's foreign policy in which "tasks of safeguarding regional security are inextricably linked with concern for preserving world peace."

CSO: 1825/92

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

BRIEFS

TUNISIAN DELEGATION VISITS TASHKENT--Tashkent OQITUVCHILAR GAZETASI in Uzbek 17 April 1985 carries on page 2 a 100-word report by an OQITUVCHILAR GAZETASI correspondent under the heading "Friendly Meeting." The report concerns the visit of Tunisian National Trade Union officials to Tashkent. The delegation included General Secretary of the Trade Union of Primary Education Workers M. Allal and Deputy General Secretary, Director of the International Department M. Trabelsi. The guests visited Tashkent schools, nurseries, and Pioneer facilities. UzSSR Minister of Education O. S. Abbosova spoke to the delegation about the state and development of people's education in Uzbekistan. [Editorial Report]

CSO: 1836/435

END

**END OF
FICHE
DATE FILMED**

OCTOBER 17, 1986

